I.—THE GREEK VERBAL IN -TEO.

PART III.—ON THE EXPRESSION OF THE AGENT.

In the earlier period of the Indo-European languages, especial prominence was given to those brief, concise, half-exclamatory expressions of an action to be accomplished, whose 'mood' was conceived of as being half-future, half-imperative, so that the command-thought contained more or less of force, according as the tone of the speaker approached the sterner realm of demand, or the tender pathos of entreaty. Meantime this flexible form could (theoretically, at least) be associated with any tense or mood of the copula. As a matter of fact, the character of the writer's style was right accurately portrayed by even so minute a matter as the omission or expression, in Gk., of the copulae— always forms of εἶναι, except in Soph., Phil. 116, where alone γίγνομαι appears. We shall see below that the expression of the copula is the norm in the more dignified style of Thucydides and Herodotus, its omission the custom in the lighter veins of comedy and dialogue. The orators occupy a middle position between the two extremes.

Naturally, this expression of a complex thought by a single form would be more natural, and hence more usual, in the complex languages of antiquity, while just such forms were gradually felt to be inexact, as we approach the later period, under the reign of simplified uniformity and analytic tendency. And, as a matter of fact, they are inexact—let us say rudimentary —expressions of a volition, for whose more precise differentiation

17

in elegant writing or where nice shadings are needed, we must substitute the more precise periphrases with δεῖ, χρή, ἀνάγκη, πρέπει, χρεών, etc.

Now, there were in Sanskrit several verb-forms corresponding more or less accurately to what we understand under "Verbalia necessitatis," or gerunds: their endings are *-ya, -tavya, -anīya, -tva, -āyia, -enya.* A corresponding richness of variety is found also in the ways in which the agent of the action was expressed. In association with a gerund in *-ya* the agent could be expressed either by the dative, genitive, or instrumental; verbalia in *-tavya* are accompanied only by an *instrumental* of the agent, while the agent for verbalia in *-āyia* appears either in the *dative* or *instrumental.* We note the strong preference for the instrumental-agent. As above stated, in the whole of the Greek literature from Homer to Aristotle, exclusive, these -τέο forms occur about 1831 times, all told. Of these 1831 cases, about 400 are accompanied by the agent-expression in some case—either dat. or acc., and in one horrible passage what appears to be διά+gen. About one vbl. in four, then, has the agent formally expressed. Now in Greek, where instrumental and true dative have in great part fallen together in form, the matter of the expression of the agent is more difficult, by reason of the twofold—manifold—nature—ambiguity, we might say—of the dative form. We readily see that by a sort of personification the Greek instrumental becomes a true agent-case; but, after all, there is a broad organic difference between an instrumental-dative, a thing-dative, and an agent-dative, which is a person-dative, indicating the sentient being interested in the act. Speaking of the pure dative, with the passive, Brugmann (Gr. Gr., p. 209) says: "In diesem Gebrauche hatten sich Dativ und Instrumentalis berührt, und sie sind öfters schwer gegen einander abzugrenzen." Similarly, l. l., p. 211, speaking of the *instrumental* dative used with the passive of "der Person, unter deren Mitwirkung eine Handlung vor sich geht," he says: "*Diese* Gebrauchsweise war mit der Verwendung des echten Dativs beim Pass. zusammengeronnen." While, then, the (personified) instrumental datives may figure as datives of the agent, the *pure* dative, of the agent, is older than this "unechter Gebrauch des Dativs," and "Es hat also (Delbrück, Griech. Syntax, p. 78, note 2) der Instrumentalis beim Passivum ursprünglich auch nur den Sinn der Begleitung."

But the Greek goes even further in permitting yet another case —the accusative—to stand as an expression of the agent; which

usage is, we are taught, confined to the Attic dialect, and into
which construction we will look more closely. This accusative
has been 'explained,' mechanically, as having arisen from a
certain confusion of this gerund-construction with that after δεῖ,
χρή, etc. So Stallbaum, Matthiä, Schülze, Krüger, Jelf, Arnold,
Blomfield, Kopetsch, Bernhardy, etc. Now, while no one can
deny that the power of analogy is great, yet we are constrained
to suspect this 'explanation,' on its very surface, by reason of its
alarmingly mechanical appearance. I had myself happened on
what I consider the true explanation of this construction before
reading those golden words of Madvig (Syntax der griechischen
Sprache, §85, and Anmerkung, p. 87), as follows: "Der Name
dessen, der die Handlung auszuführen hat, wird im Dativ ...
zum Gerundiv gesetzt ... Aber bei dem unpersönlich gebrauch-
ten Gerundiv steht der Name der handelnden Person auch im
Accusativ ... *Man duchte sich die handelnde Person im Allge-
meinen ohne das Spezielle, durch den Dativ bezeichnete Verhält-
niss, und doch auch nicht als wirkliches grammatisches Subject*
(Nominativ)." Here we have the true 'explanation.' The accu-
sative expresses merely the person, *with regard to whom*, rela-
tively to whom, the act is to be fulfilled: the agency is, as it were,
only suggested in this variety of the acc. of specification, which
is more vague, less specific than the formal dative would be.
Again, it is constantly reiterated that this agent-accusative is
confined to the impersonal, gerund usage, not the personal
gerundive. Then we easily see the parallelism between the
personalness of the personal construction with its preference for
the sentient dative, and the impersonalness of the impersonal
construction with its lethargic accusative. Moreover, that former
law about the use of the accusative as agent-case is not violated
in the earlier language by a single exception. All these cases of
the accusative-agent occur with verbals which are either evidently
impersonal, or else ambiguous, such as, e. g., Eur., Iph. Taur. 111
τολμητέον ... λαβεῖν, where λαβεῖν *may* be either nom. or acc., and
hence does not demonstrably violate the usage. Then just here
we, at a blow, reduce a number of ambiguous cases at once: so
soon as the agent-accus. appears in connection with a vbl. which
would otherwise be grammatically a dubium, we at once know
the vbl. to be impersonal, and hence its accompanying inf. neut.
noun, pronoun, or what not is the *obj.* of the vbl. Then the
interesting result follows that, e. g., in Plato, Laws 778 B, the

indirect question is, tested by this proof, in the accusative case. Only the presence, therefore, of such an agent-accus. enables us to decide whether a vexatious τοῦτο or so is in the acc. or nom. Whether we are satisfied with this 'law' or not, we must recognize it until a violation of it can be proved: such violation I have found nowhere in the something like 10,500 T. pages of known or accessible literature between Homer and Aristotle. Then the Greek is capable of expressing a shade of the relationship between verbal and agent which neither the Latin nor the Sanskrit possesses. Nor is it unnatural that the Greek should have chosen just this case, having as the language did that especial preference for the 'acc. of specification,' which has therefore received the name of the Greek accus., κατ' ἐξοχήν.

Proceeding hurriedly to the passages illustrating the construction of the agent-accusative, we note that it does not appear in Aeschylus or Sophocles; and in all the much more bulky Euripides we find only two instances—Hippolytus 491 and Iph. Taur. 111—in both of which instances the agent-person is not expressed outright, but referred to by participles in the accusative, e. g. τολμητέον τοι ξεστὸν ἐκ ναοῦ λαβεῖν ἄγαλμα πάσας προσφέροντε μηχανάς. The first open expression of the agent by the acc. of a personal pronoun occurs in Aristophanes, Equites 72: ποίαν ὁδὸν νὼ τρεπτέον. Then if the Hippolytus was brought out in 428 and the Equites in 424, we locate the known beginning of this usage about 425–430. Aristophanes' other cases are Eccles. 875–6: βαδιστέον . . . δειπνήσοντα . . . κοὐ μελλητέον, and Aves 1237: οἷς θυτέον αὐτούς, where the dative-agent case had to be avoided, to prevent ambiguity, by reason of the immediate proximity of the other dative, οἷς. Gross (III, p. 9) errs in stating that Aristophanes uses this construction only once! We might even add a fourth case, if we accept the MS reading μ' in Vesp. 1514 (instead of γ', with Bergk, Richter and others).

Leaving the poets, and omitting Herodotus, who naturally does not use this Attic construction, we hurriedly view the three Thucydidean instances of its use. Stylistic reasons make it preferable, if not necessary, to avoid another dative in I 72: ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς παριτητέα, etc., and I 86: δίκαις καὶ λόγοις διακριτέα. More interesting is VIII 65: λόγος αὐτοῖς . . . ὡς οὔτε μισθοφορητέον εἴη ἄλλους: here the vagueness of the negative and hence rejected thought is in keeping with the expression of that agent by the accusative; but so soon as the definite numeral, πεντακισχιλίοις, is

introduced, immediately the construction passes over into the dative. Xenophon is no lover of this construction, never using it in the Cyropaedia, Anabasis, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Hiero, Agesilaus, Resp. Laced., De re equestri, Cynegeticus and Apologia. Nor in the Hellenika, since VI 3, 7 is no exception; and in his later edition Breitenbach retracts his erroneous statement in the '63 edition, to the effect that ἀλλήλους is acc. agent. On the other hand, Gross (III, p. 10) is in error again in giving to the Mem. two cases of this construction. The accusative occurs only *once* directly associated with the verbal, while in two other cases the inevitable participle appears, referring back to the omitted agent-accus. But in one of these passages (III 11, 2) the acc. is necessary to avoid confusion with the neighbouring dat., while in another passage (I 5, 5) the reading is uncertain and Kühner reads ἱκετεύειν, not ἱκετευτέον. Considering the un-Xenophontean nature of this construction, we are confirmed in what suspicions we may have had relatively to the genuineness of the Hipparchicus, when we find in its short 203 Teub. pages three instances of this construction: I 12, VIII 12, I 5, in the latter alone of which cases there is some doubt as to the proper interpretation of the acc., as the verb in question, ἀσκητέον, may show either the neuter or the active sense.

Twenty-five of those of Plato's Dialogues which contain verbalia in -τέο at all, show no trace of this construction. There is nothing of especial interest to note in the 4 instances in the Gorgias, 1 in Crito, 4 in Theaetet.; in Sophistes 226 A we note the rather abrupt shift from the χρή-construction to this agent-accusative expression. Politicus and Phaidros each show 2 instances. The dative of the agent would have been less elegant in the pseudo-Platonic Anterastai 138 E, where, as in several other cases, we suspect the O. O. construction of some subtle influence. Similarly, the agent-dative is naturally avoided in Republic 349 A: ἀποκνητέον γε τῷ λόγῳ ἐπεξελθεῖν σκοπούμενον. The *nine* other verbalia in the Republic, which are accompanied by the accus. agent, show only the usual phenomena—acc. for dat. to avoid ambiguity, acc. agent referred to by the (somewhat remote) participle, etc. A vexatious passage is 400 D: ταῦτά γε λόγῳ ἀκολουθητέον: if ταῦτα is the accus. of the agent, it is the only case in which such an agent-case is used in reference to things, and that in neut. pl.; if ταῦτα is subject, only its position in the sentence prevents a flagrant solecism in its not agreeing in number

with its predicate adj.; if ταῦτα is acc. of specification, the construction is, to say the least of it, a unique one. The last of Plato's dialogues to be considered here is that bulky work which our very uncertain chronology places toward the end of the master's life, viz. the Laws, and its 18 loci present no especially difficult features. The passage 803 E is corrupt, but the reading so far as concerns the vbl. practically sound; similarly 862 B. Sudden changes from datives to accusatives also appear, but the reasons are almost always easily patent, e. g. 966 A: τοὺς φύλακας ἡμῖν γνωστέον; more sudden is the change from dative to accusative in 862 B. In 808 D the construction glides out from under the influence of χρεών, and the vbl.+acc. agent takes its place. We can hardly help suspecting a confusion of constructions and influences in 643 A: φαμὲν ἰτέον εἶναι τὸν λόγον; the construction can not be pronounced personal, since ἰτέος is never so used, nor could an uncompounded neuter verbal be thus made passive. To force this interpretation would therefore necessitate our accepting an unwarranted and unique violation of otherwise exceptionless laws—the passivity of the personal construction on the one hand, and the neuterness of the uncompounded neuter verbal on the other. But here again the O. O. is to blame for the confusion, and the resulting words—illogical or incorrect, from the strict grammarian's point of view—for all that sounded well to the ear. The construction finally seems to appear in the spurious Epinomis 991 C. Then the percentage in Plato is low enough as it is, but it would be still lower, were it not for that erratic spurt of accusatives in the Laws. But the Platonic scholar expects erratic experiments in the Laws.

The field of Oratory will detain us but for a very brief space, as out of the whole Decas only three—Andocides, Isocrates, and Demosthenes—seem to have tolerated this construction. Andocides' example—III 40; the oration is suspected as being spurious —occurs in O. O.; Demosthenes, like Andocides, uses it only once, II 13, as also Isocrates had done before that in the oration IX 7, where the neighbouring dative, τοῖς φρονοῦσιν, makes the acc.-agent case preferable. The other Isocratean locus is in Epist. VI 9, where, by the way, apart from what suspicion naturally hovers about these epistles, the position of the participle strikes us as anomalous, it preceding its verbal by an unusual distance. Dinarchus, I 112 hardly counts among these loci, as it has evidently arisen by a pure anacoluthon, the long construction being for-

gotten: προσεκτέον ὑμῖν . . . εἰδότας, etc., to which change again the proximity of the dative λόγοις added its impetus.

All told, then, we have 55 or 56 cases of the accusative-agent construction, but in the majority of these cases the real agent is merely referred to by the participle, which participle is in the sg. about as often as pl. indifferently—43 cases together, leaving 12 cases in which the agent is expressed fully, by nouns (6 times?), pronouns (4 times), etc.

The opinion prevails that the *copula* is regularly omitted, when the agent-accus. is expressed (cf. Schülze, p. 14; Kühner, §428, An. 2, etc.). The facts of the case are as follows: out of the 56 instances the copula is expressed in 13, being omitted, therefore, in about 4 cases in every 5. When expressed the copula is in the infinitive in 5 instances, in all of which the *expression* of the copula was more or less essential to clearness of the oblique construction; similarly in another case the opt. + ἄν was necessarily expressed, for clearness' sake.

Why then, in conclusion, is the less usual accusative ever used to express the agent? There is an unmistakable *flavor of indefiniteness* about the accusative in all the earliest examples, and the slight preponderance of plurals over singulars may have its root in the less specific nature of a plural as versus the exclusive and rigidly personal singular, and even here we must exclude those singulars behind which we can easily detect a class-name, and which are therefore practically plurals. The universality, the more sweeping flavor of the plural is in sympathy with the somewhat similar tone of the acc. agent. Or, to express it more accurately, the *acc. agent* is *objective*, the *dat. agent* is *subjective*. And in beautiful harmony with that fact is the circumstance that with the accusative-agent case the sentient, subjective personal pronoun is *regularly avoided*—I count only 6 cases of its use in all classic Greek, and of these the only singular is more than suspected; in fact is rejected by not a few scholars, all the remaining ones being in the more universal plural. But very different is the case the moment the dative-agent case appears. Here the pronoun is not only *freely* admitted, but it is by a large majority more sought than the colder, less subjective nouns and participles; indeed, of the something like 344 instances of the dative agent, the great majority—about 270—*are* personal pronouns, and of that goodly number over the half again are of the 1st person (139), the 2d person claiming the next largest number (68), while

the least subjective, the 3d person, has the fewest examples (62). Again, we note a beautiful parallelism between the specific, subjective dative agent and its accompanying pronouns, preferably in the 1st person; also a corresponding parallelism between the vague, general, objective accusative agent and its avoidance of pronouns, and preference for the more general class-name, e. g. nouns, participles, etc. The acc. agent is more remote than the interested dat. agent. Hence the acc. agent would be naturally used (a) of that which is beyond the control of the real 'agent'; hence, e. g., of exigencies or dire necessity in tragedy, etc. (β) The same in the mouth of the quasi-resigned comic actor, in whose mouth what was in tragedy serious helplessness becomes ludicrous helplessness, or, if you choose, indifference; hence Aristophanes' ποίαν ὁδὸν νὼ τρεπτέον. (γ) The intermediate or resultant passionless sense of vagueness.

Then the sphere of this accusative is narrow. Oratory spurns it, and in the 2949 T. pages of the Attic orators we count only 5 meagre cases, and of these not all are *pure* cases, as necessities of style, etc., obtruded on occasion, and Dinarchus' blunder does not count.

ON THE COPULA WITH THE GERUND.

The omission of the copula is so common an occurrence in the classics that at first blush we are surprised to learn that the development of the copula belongs to the later period of language-formation, and is "die schwerste Production des menschlichen Geistes und die letzte in dem eigentlich nothwendigen Material" (Haase, Vorlesungen über lat. Spt. I, p. 55). But the very ease with which it could be supplied when omitted caused it to be omitted all the more, and hence retarded the otherwise rapid development of this extremely common verb. In Sanskrit the omission of the copula is especially common with verbal derivatives, participles in -*ya*, etc. (cf. Delbrück, Altindische Syntax, pp. 11 and 15); so common, indeed, is this omission that the copula, whether a form of *as* or *bhū*, is never expressed in prose with the verbal in -*ya*, whose function very closely approached that of the -*reo*-formations. Similarly in the older Latinity *esse* is regularly omitted with the fut. act. part. and with the gerundive (Dziatzko, Terence Adelphoe, vs. 13, and cf. vs. 46), while in the *sermo vulgaris* such liberties are allowed only in fixed cases. The omission of the copula in exclamatory or quasi-exclamatory

clauses is almost a psychological necessity. Of all Roman writers it seems that Tacitus takes the greatest liberties in this respect (cf. Kühnast, Liv. Synt., pp. 276-9). In the Slav and Semitic languages the present of the verb 'to be,' when accompanied by a predicate noun, is regularly omitted.

As noted above, the copula to the verbal in -τεο is always some form of εἶναι, save in the one passage Soph., Phil. 116, where γίγνομαι appears; passages like Plato, Rep. 595 A, etc., are only apparent exceptions: there is an ellipsis of the copula.

As above stated, the whole number of verbalia recorded between Theognis and Dinarchus, inclusive, is 1831. Speaking generally, the copula is expressed with about one in five of those verbals, the number of expressed copulae being 358. Then the omission of the copula is the rule with the verbal, as elsewhere in the less dignified style, or in quasi-interjectional clauses, where the ἐστί seems tame and insipid. In preparing the above statistics I have counted as 'copula omitted' cases like the ἀκουστέα in Plato, Laws 724 B: ἐστὶ ῥητέα τε καὶ ἀκουστέα; for in many cases it would be impossible to define the limits beyond which an easily supplied copula should be considered omitted, and when not. Now, the suggestion has been thrown out that the copula is *regularly expressed* with the (personal) gerundive. Such is not the case. Of the 91 gerundives considered as certainly personal, 32 are accompanied by the expressed copula—about one in three. The per cent., then, with gerundives is higher than the norm, but not yet so high that we can say that it is 'regularly expressed.' But to be more minute, let us take the literature by departments. In tragedy the conscious omission of the copula is the norm, it being expressed only, or generally, when necessary for clearness' sake, *metri gratia*, etc. The statistics are as follows. In tragedy:

> Copula omitted = 95,
> Copula expressed = 15;

ratio about 1 : 6+. In comedy the expressed copula is far more usual than in tragedy. In comedy:

> Copula omitted = 44,
> Copula expressed = 23;

ratio about 1 : 2—. In history the expression of the copula has gone far beyond its previous restrictions, and the copula is

expressed in Herodotus and Thucydides much more frequently
than omitted!   In history:

Herodotus: copula omitted = 3; expressed = 18.
Thucydides: copula omitted = 12; expressed = 19.
                                   ——   ——
                                   15   37

Thus, for history the ratio is about 1 : 2 in favor of the expressed
copula.

Xenophon varies, naturally.   According as he approaches the
more strictly historic style, he assumes the historiographer's
mode, and the copula appears more frequently; e. g.

	Copula omitted.	Copula expressed.
Memorabilia,	35	10
Anabasis,	8	14
Cyropaedia,	16	19
Hellenika,	5	15
	64	58

Otherwise Xenophon's usage approaches that of the tragedians:
where the tragic norm is about 1 : 6, the norm for Xenophon,
exclusive of the above four works, is about 1 : 4.

With Plato the omission of the copula is the reigning habit, to
which only one of his pieces offers any serious exception, viz. the
Gorgias.   Exclude the Gorgias, and Plato's statistics are: .

Copula omitted   = 918 times,
Copula expressed = 92 times;

ratio, therefore, about 1 : 10.   But in the Gorgias the copula is
omitted 26 times, expressed 12 times!   To this anomalous
freedom of its use the Epistles alone offer an analogy, where the
copula is omitted 7 times, expressed 8 times, by whoever was the
author of those letters.   In oratory, again, the habit changes:
here the freer expression of the copula is a characteristic trait.
For the whole corpus—as my statistics have it, the copula is
omitted 130 times, expressed only 101 times: again we note the
parallelism between the more elegant precision of the oratorical
usage and the expression of the copula—which expression was,
naturally, all the more essential in spoken orations, since the more
fleeting impression had to be explicit, to be quite clear and hence
forcible.   In fact, Lysias, Lycurgus and Dinarchus express the

copula more frequently than not, these three orators together showing 5 cases of the omitted copula, as versus 12 expressed. Andocides and Isaeus use it 4 times, omit it 4 times; the others expressing it somewhat less freely than not.

When expressed the copula is more frequently in the indicative; the most usual form is, naturally, ἐστί, which occurs 160 times, εἰσί occurring only twice (Herod., Xen.). Nor does any other person or number of the present indicative occur at all, save that one lone 1st pl. in Demosthenes, LIV 44. Apart from the present, both the imperfect (14 times) and the future (6 times) occur in the indicative, but always in the 3d person, and always in the singular, except in two passages in Plato, Republic, books E and ζ, where the 3d pl. of the future appears. The infinitive— always present—never occurs in the drama; of the 122 cases of its expression, the bulk (101 cases) occurs in Herodotus (3), Thucydides (9), Xenophon (43) and Plato (46); Isocrates (8) and Aeschines (2) together furnish just the same number of instances as Demosthenes (10), while the remaining one case occurs in Andocides. The copula appears in the optative 42 times, but always in the present, save in Soph., Philoctet. 116, a passage alluded to above. Plato, Politicus 275 C is the only passage in which the optative copula occurs in the plural: these optatives are especially frequent in ideal conditional apodoses. After Xenophon the use of the optative becomes much less frequent— only 2 of these 42 examples occur in tragedy, while 22 occur in Herod., Thucyd. and Xenophon. There are 7 cases of the copula in the participle (3 in sg., 4 in pl.), and always in O. O., save once, in "der längsten und langweiligsten von allen Isocrates' Reden," XV. This participle never occurs in the drama, and only once each in Herodotus and Thucydides, and then in the pl. The least frequent form of the copula is the subjunctive, represented by only 4 instances—once (apparently) in Theognis, once in Sophocles, once in the Hipparchos (II 6), and once in Krito, 48 C, where the expression of the copula was necessary for clearness' sake, even at the expense of such cacophony as σκεπτέον ᾖ ᾖ. Noticeable is the higher percentage of optatives in the written literature (e. g. history) as versus the colloquial style, where indicatives prevail; indeed, Aristophanes uses the indicative exclusively. That the infinitive ranks next to the indicative in the matter of frequence of occurrence is natural, since the infinitive is no mood really, but merely a verb-form doing duty

for the indicative in oblique constructions, and thus is often an indicative in disguise.

We close with a hasty view of the *position* preferred by the copula, relatively to its verbal. In tragedy it precedes (4 times immediately, 3 times with intervening words) just as often as it follows the verbal (directly 2 times, with intervening words 5 times).   The copula does not precede quite so freely in comedy as in tragedy. Aristophanes and the (fragments of) other comedians together place the copula before its verbal 9 times (6 times directly, 3 times indirectly), after it 14 times (7 times directly, 7 times indirectly).   Accordingly, for the dramatists we infer that the preferable position for the copula is *following, with other words between copula and verbal*; the next most desirable position is *immediately preceding*; then *immediately following*; then *preceding, with intervening words*.   Very different is the prose usage.   Thucydides *never*, Herodotus only twice, allows the copula to precede its verbal. The copula follows its verbal immediately 12 times in Herodotus, and just the same number of times in Thucydides; it follows with intervening words 7 times in Thucydides, 4 times in Herodotus.   Thus the results for Thucydides and Herodotus are as follows:

Copula immediately preceding = 1; preceding, with intervening words = 1.
Copula immediately following = 24; following, with intervening words = 11.

Then the strong preference, among historians, is for the postposition of the copula, and preferably the immediate postposition. Here again, as otherwise, Xenophon's usage approaches the historians' norm in the Hellenika, Anabasis and Cyropaedia. The statistics for these works are:

Copula preceding = 7; copula preceding, with intervening words = 1.
Copula following = 33; copula following, with intervening words = 8.

These totals (preceding = 8, following = 41) are not unlike the results for the historians. Nor does the usage in Xenophon's other writings diverge seriously from the prose norm.   The statistics are as follows:

Cop. immediately preceding = 7; cop. preceding, with intervening words = 2.
Cop. immediately following = 51 ; cop. following, with intervening words = 19.

Here again the preference is for immediate postposition ; the next most desirable position is postposition with intervening words; ·the least desirable, preposition with intervening words.   So,

practically, for other prose-writers; take, e. g., Plato, whose statistics are as follows:

Immediate preposition = 12; preposition, with intervening words = 5.
Immediate postposition = 63; postposition, with intervening words = 24.

We notice a slight rise in the number of instances of separated preposition of the copula in the orators—a dash of artificiality we might suspect—thus,

Cop. immediately prepositive = 14; prepositive, with intervening words = 10.
Cop. immediately postpositive = 59; postpositive, with intervening words = 18.

The number of words allowed to intervene between copula and verbal varies from 1 to 12 (which extreme number occurs only once, Dem. XX 154). Before Plato the greatest number allowed to intervene before the verbal was 3, the greatest number after the verbal was 6 (once in Aristophanes). Plato increased the number of intervening words preceding the verbal to 6, following it to 5. The greatest liberty in these matters appears, naturally, among the orators, and, peculiarly enough, their most remarkable experiments appear when the copula *precedes* its verbal (1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 12 words intervening), while the number of intervening words does not exceed 4 when the copula is postpositive.

Then in all the departments of the period under examination the statistics are as follows: copula immediately prepositive = 44; copula prepositive, but with intervening words = 24; copula directly postpositive = 206; copula postpositive, with intervening words = 84. The fact that greater distance is allowed between the prepositive than the postpositive copula and its verbal is, we think, in keeping with the artificial nature of the construction: the number of words allowed to stand between the verbal and its preceding copula is on an average about three times the number interposed when the copula is postpositive; but Demosthenes' odd freak (XX 154) distorts the true proportion.

As stated above, the 97 gerundives show a total of 32 copulae expressed, a ratio something above the general norm, including the impersonalia. This is in natural harmony with the fact that the gerundives are quasi-adjectives, and hence their verb-force is necessarily weaker than that of the gerunds, wherefore the greater need of copulae.

CHARLES EDWARD BISHOP.

II.—SEMASIOLOGICAL POSSIBILITIES.

II.

In vol. XIX, No. 1 of this Journal I endeavored, by tracing the development in meaning of several roots, to prove that "difference in meaning is no bar to connecting words." It is equally true, or rather consequently true, that *similarity in meaning is no ground for connecting words*. For as the signification of a word depends more upon the manner in which it is used than upon its primary meaning, the same idea may be expressed in various ways. I do not mean where we consciously use figures of speech, but where words are used in what we now feel to be a concrete sense. For example, whatever may be the word for 'tongue' in various languages, it has come to denote practically the same thing, though the figures of speech that brought the several words into vogue might be entirely different. Or again, *heavy, schwer, gravis* are synonymous not only when referring to weight, but also in many metaphorical uses of these terms. And yet the ideas implied in their origin are quite distinct. This is true in numberless cases.

That this must be so is easy to be seen. For as various meanings develop from a common centre, and any derived meaning may, in turn, become a centre of development, there are many intertwinings of meaning within any related group of words, and many coincidences among unrelated groups. I do not hesitate to say, therefore, that the signification of a word is mainly a matter of development, and though this may be traced back, it can not be foretold. If, then, we find a related group of words with closely allied significations, we may, it is true, easily point out the common idea in that group, but we can not with certainty know the primary meaning. In order to discover this it is necessary to have variety and difference in meaning; and the greater this variety and difference, the more easily can the centre of divergence be found. From Goth. *flōkan* 'bewail' and OHG. *fluohhōn* 'curse' it would be impossible to know the primary meaning, but Lat. *plangō*, Gk. πλήσσω show us that the original

idea in this group at least was 'beat, strike'; and consequently we may connect with OHG. *fluohhōn* 'curse' OE. *flōcan*[1] 'clap, applaud.'

Of coincidences in meaning among unrelated words but little need be said. These arise, as I have said, in the process of development. A given meaning may be found in a large number of roots, because the possibilities for the development of that meaning are very great. Thus the meaning 'swell' occurs in the root ʒᵘ*el-*, OHG. *quellan* 'swell'; ʒᵘ*er-*, Gk. βρύω 'swell'; *k̑eu̯-*, Skt. *çváyati* 'swells'; *pīd-*, Gk. πῖδαξ 'spring,' OE. *fǣted* 'fat'; *teu̯o-*, *tū-* 'swell,' and its many derivatives; *ei̯d-*, Gk. οῖδος 'swelling'; *su̯el-*, OE. *swellan* 'swell'; *bhelgh*, OHG. *belgan* 'swell'; and in numerous others.

1.—An interesting development is shown by the root *nek̑-* 'reach, come to.' This gives: (1) Skt. *náçati* 'come to, reach, attain,' Lat. *nanciscor* 'obtain,' Goth. *ga-nauhan* 'suffice, ausreichen,' Gk. ἐνεγκεῖν 'bear,' i. e. 'cause to come to' : (2) Skt. *náçyati* ['reach the end'] 'perish, get lost, vanish,' Gk. νεκρός 'corpse,' Lat. *nex* 'murder,' *necāre* 'slay,' *noceō* 'injure,' etc. A striking parallel to this is Lat. *pereō* 'go through' : 'pass away, perish, be lost, vanish.' Similarly in Ger. *hinkommen* : *umkommen*; Goth. *qiman* 'come, arrive' : *usqiman* 'slay.' For this connection cf. Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb., s. v. *naus*, who, however, explains differently the development in meaning. Such examples are the best evidence of the truth of the thesis for which I contend. I therefore submit other examples in which is traced the semasiological development of several roots.

2.—The IE. root *pĕd-*, *pŏd-* shows in its derivatives such a wide range of meaning that the relation between these derivatives is often lost sight of or even denied. Especially is this true among Germanists. For example, Kluge, Et. Wb., supposes that in OHG. *fazzōn* several different roots have fallen together. Such a possibility I do not deny, but it is capable of proof that the various meanings therein contained may come from the same source, and that there is, therefore, no semasiological reason for referring the word to more than one root. This root I regard as *pĕd-*, *pŏd-*, which I believe is one in origin wherever found.

---

[1] This word is not given by Kluge or Uhlenbeck in their Et. Wbb., but the connection I have seen somewhere, and it is undoubtedly correct.

The primary meaning of this root was 'downness,' if I may coin such a word. This would give for the noun 'base, bottom, foot,' for the verb 'fall, sink down,' for the adverb 'down, below.' When once the root took on the signification 'foot,' the verb naturally meant 'to foot it, step, go.' This, according to usage, would mean simply 'go, travel' or 'go lightly' or 'go rapidly,' etc. Again, the causative of 'fall' is 'cause to fall,—sink down,' hence 'weigh down, load.' A slightly different development is 'cause to sink down, bend (primarily down, later in any way), grasp, encircle, bind,'—'encircle, gird, dress, adorn,' etc.

Examples showing this development are: Gk. πέζα 'foot, bottom, end, hem,' πεζός 'on foot, on the ground,' πούς 'foot,' Skt. *pād-*, *pad-*, Goth. *fōtus*, etc., Gk. πέδον 'ground, earth,' πεδόθεν 'from the bottom,' OChSl. *podŭ* 'bottom,' Lat. *pessum* 'down' (cf. Klotz, Jahn's Neue Jahrb., vol. XL, 1844, p. 26 f.); Skt. *padá-* 'step, footstep, place, home,' *pāda-* 'foot, leg, ray,' Lith. *pèdà*, Lat. *peda* 'step' and probably also *passus*<*pəd-tu-s*, ON. *fet* 'footstep'; Lith. *padis*, Lat. *pedō* 'prop'; *pedō* 'splayfoot,' Gk. πηδόν 'blade of the oar,' πηδάλιον 'rudder'; Skt. *padyatē* 'fall, sink down, perish; go, step' (this meaning secondary, as explained above), OE. *fetan*, OHG. *fezzan* 'fall,' *fazzōn* 'go' (for other meanings see below), OChSl. *padǫ* 'fall,' ON. *feta* 'find the way,' Lith. *pėditi* 'step lightly,' Gk. πηδάω 'spring' (cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb.).

The causative 'cause to fall,—sink down, weigh,' etc., appears in OHG. *fazzōn* 'load down' ('arm, clothe,' probably through a different development), *fazza* 'load, weight, bundle.' With these compare Lat. *pendō* 'cause to hang down, weigh,' *pondus* 'weight.' The causative 'cause to fall, bend, crook' occurs in Lat. *pandō* 'bend,' *pandus* 'bent' (from *pənd-*), *pedum* 'shepherd's crook.' Closely connected with this is the meaning 'clutch, hold,' as in Lat. *impediō* 'clasp, encircle, embrace, entangle, hinder, detain,' etc. This is supposed to come from the primary signification 'entangle the feet,' as indeed it may have done. But we are not shut up to that explanation. The fact probably is that the meaning 'hold, seize' developed from the root *pĕd-* along different lines. For *impediō* I believe the meaning came from 'bend.' And even in *compes*, which is supposed to be primarily 'shackle for the feet,' the usage gives a more general meaning. The word may even be used for 'necklace.' So in Gk. πέδη 'fetter,' πεδάω 'bind, fasten' the meaning was or became general. But, however

developed, the words in popular usage were probably connected with 'foot,' with which they are undoubtedly related, even if not in the manner usually given. Of the same origin, whatever that may be, are OE. *fetel*, ON. *fetell*, OHG. *fezzil* 'band, belt' and OE., OS. *feter*, ON. *fioturr*, OHG. *fezzira* 'fetter.' These two groups Kluge separates. But, as we have seen, the word was used in the widest sense both as noun and as verb. No one, I imagine, would deny that Lat. *impedio* is from the root *pĕd-* 'foot,' and yet the meaning of that word is anything but 'bind the feet.' As certainly akin to *pĕd-*, *pōd-* 'foot' is OHG. *fazzōn*. The very variety of its significations is evidence for, not against, this connection. The correspondences in meaning are surprisingly well retained. Thus OHG. *fazzōn* 'seize, hold' : Lat. *impedio* 'clasp, check,' Gk. πεδάω 'fasten' (e. g. door); OHG. *che-uazzo* 'amplector' : Lat. *impedio* 'embrace'; OHG. *fazzōn* 'load, saddle, equip' : Lat. *impeditus* 'encumbered with baggage,' *impedimentum* 'baggage'; OHG. *fazzōn* 'go,' ON. *feta* 'find the way,' *fet* 'step' : Lat. *peda*, Skt. *padyatē* 'goes'; OHG. *fezzan*, OE. *fetan* 'fall' : Skt. *padyatē* 'falls,' etc.

These correspondences are not accidental, but prove that these words are from the same source, and that they have developed along the same lines. They make it probable also that the primary meaning of Gk. πεδάω, Lat. *impedio*, OHG. *fazzōn* was not 'bind the feet,' but 'bend, bind, weigh down.' These words are, of course, of secondary origin, but the stem from which they were derived probably meant 'bond, band' in general, or 'weight, load,' that which causes one to sink down. From 'pack, load, equip' it is an easy step to 'overlay, clothe, adorn,' or these meanings might come from 'encircle, surround, gird.' Such a development is found in MHG. *vazzen* 'mit gold, farbe u. dgl. überziehen, rüsten, kleiden, schmücken,' OE. *fæted* 'adorned,' Goth. *fētjan* 'adorn,' ON. *fat* 'clothing,' etc. From 'hold' develops OE. *fæt*, ON. *fat*, OHG. *faz* 'vessel,' OE. *fætels* 'tub, vessel, pouch,' from which *fætelsian* 'put into a vessel.' Similarly OE. *fætan inn* 'take in, swallow,' i. e. 'to pouch,' just as Eng. *pouch* is used in the sense of 'eat.' In OE. *fetian*, *feccan* 'fetch, summon, seek, take, seize, gain, marry' is preserved a causative to Germ. **fetan* 'go,' cf. ON. *feta* 'find the way.' In this word, 'seize, gain' comes from 'come to, reach,' as in Skt. *prati-pad*.

3.—The IE. root *erebh-*, *erbh-*, *rebh-* occurs in several groups of words which it is customary to separate. These may be, and
18

therefore should be, connected. The primary meaning was probably 'press upon, compress.' Hence 'enclose, cover' is the prevailing idea of the following group: Gk. ἐρέφω 'roof over, enwreathe'; ὄροφος 'covering'; OHG. *hirnireba* 'skull'; *rippa*, OE. *ribb* 'rib'; OHG. *reba* 'rebe.' Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. ἐρέφω; Kluge, s. v. *Rippe.* Here probably belong Lat. *arbor*, *arbutus*, *arbustum* and *rabuscula*, and also *orbis*, etc. To this root we may also refer the unexplained Gk. ἔρφος 'hide, skin,' i. e. 'covering.' This is better than the connection I made in Mod. Lang. Notes, XIII, No. 5, 289. To this I should join Lith. *arbonas* 'cattle,' not "arbeitendes tier," as explained in PBB. 16, 562, but 'the hide-bearing animal.' From the meaning 'covered' we may also come to Gk. ὀρφνός 'dark,' OHG. *erpf*, ON. *iarpr*, OE. *earp* 'dark.' Noreen, UL. 89.

From 'press upon, distress' have developed the significations in OE. *earfoð* 'full of hardship, grievous, difficult,' and as noun 'hardship, distress, difficulty,' Goth. *arbaiþs* 'pressure of business' (II Cor. 11, 28), 'toil, work,' OHG. *arabeit* 'hardship, distress, toil.' With these have been compared OChSl. *rabŭ*, *robŭ* 'servant,' Pol. *robić* 'to work,' Arm. *arbaneak* 'servant.' Schade, Wb., s. v. *arabeit.* For the supposed connection with Lith. *dárbas* see below.

A slightly different development of meaning is seen in the stem **orbho-* 'bereaved.' This has come from the general signification 'distressed, grieved,' or else has developed from 'press upon, rub, strip,' as in Lat. *stringō* 'press together' and 'strip off.' Here belong Gk. ὀρφανός 'orphan,' Lat. *orbus*, Goth. *arbi* 'inheritance,' from **orbhio-* 'belonging to an orphan.'

4.—Lith. *dárbas* 'work,' *darbùs* 'laborious,' *dìrbti* 'to work,' which Uhlenbeck supposes to be connected with Goth. *arbaiþs* (cf. PBB. 16, 562, and Et. Wb., s. v. *arbaiþs*), have nearer relatives in Germ., to say the least. These are OE. *ge-deorf* < **dherbho-* 'labor, effort, hardship,' *deorfan* 'to labor, perish,' *dierfan* 'injure.'

The primary meaning of this group was evidently 'endurance, suffering, exertion,' and hence 'toil, labor.' That was the very basis of the idea of 'toil.' Notice also the OE. 'labor' : 'perish.' For the same development of meaning compare Kluge, Et. Wb., s. v. *sterben*, and especially Gk. κάμνω 'am weary, exhausted; feel trouble, am distressed; work hard'; οἱ καμόντες 'the dead.'

From the idea of 'exertion, distress' comes that of 'agitation.' Hence we may add to the above group Goth. *drōbjan*, OE. *drēfan*, OHG. *truoben* 'agitate, disturb, distress,' OS. *drōbian* 'be distressed,' OHG. *truobi* 'dull, cloudy, muddy,' *truobisal* 'affliction, distress,' etc. Here also, with Uhlenbeck, ON. *draf*, OE. *dræf*, OHG. *trebir* 'dregs,' but not ON. *dregg*.

The root *dher-bh-* is in all probability an outgrowth of *dher-* 'bear, endure.' We may therefore dismiss Uhlenbeck's comparison between Lith. *dárbas* and Goth. *arbaiþs*. It can not be emphasized too much that similarity of meaning should always be cause for suspicion. Words that have been separated for several thousand or even several hundred years we should expect to find with divergent meanings. This is true not only of words in different languages, but also of those in the same tongue which have long been separated in function.

To this same root *dher-bh-*, *dhre-bh-* belong Gk. τρέφω 'make firm, thicken, curdle (milk), feed,' etc., ταρφέες 'thick, dense,' τάρφος 'thicket,' τρόφις 'large, big.' Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. τρέφω. And here we may add OE. *dearf*, ON. *djarfr*, *djörf*, *djarft*, OS. *derbi* 'bold.' Here the development 'be firm, bold' is the same as in the root *dher-s-* 'be bold, dare' in Skt. *dhárṣati* 'dares,' Goth. *ga-daursan*, etc.

We have in the above groups two main lines of development from the root-meaning of *dher-* 'firm, hard.' These are: 'be firm, hard, endure, suffer, be distressed, toil,' etc.; and 'be firm, hard, thicken, become large'; to which is closely related the idea in 'firm, bold.'

The same meaning as in Gk. τρέφομαι 'be clotted, coagulate' is seen also in θρόμβος 'lump, clot,' θρομβόομαι 'curdle, coagulate.' These have been compared with Lith. *drambāžius*, *dramblȳs* 'Dickbauch,' *drimbù*, *dripti* 'in klumpen herabfallen, klecksen,' *drebiù* 'Breiiges werfen, dass es spritzt, klecksen.'

The root contained in θρόμβος ends in *b*, which might have arisen phonetically or might represent a root *dhre-b*, a by-form of *dhre-bh-*. The Lith. words also may come from *dhreb-*. At any rate, we have this form of the root in Germ. in words which are certainly related: OE. *drepan* 'strike, hit' (with weapon), *ge-drep* 'stroke' (of dart), ON. *drepa* 'strike, slay,' *dráp*, OSw. *dráp* 'slaughter,' OHG. *treffan* 'hit, fight.' The Germ. verb *drepan* is evidently a denominative from the stem **dhrebo-*, meaning primarily, as in Greek, 'clot, clod, lump,' and then missile, weapon

of any kind. The verb therefore meant 'hit with a clod, weapon,' just as Lith. *drebiù* means 'hit with a clot, bespatter.' The only difference in the development of meaning is that *drebiù* signifies 'hit with a soft mass,' while *drepan* is to 'hit with a hard mass.'

Here also may belong the Germ. verb-stem *dreup-*, *drup-* 'drop,' with a secondary ablaut coming from *drup-<dhṛb-*, as in OE. *dropen*, pret. part. of *drepan*, Beow. 2981, or in MLG. *drupen* beside *drepen* in the present. As in *drepan* we saw the meaning 'hit with clods,' so here we have the corresponding intransitive 'fall in clots' as in Lith. *drimbù, drìpti.* However, it is better to refer Germ. *dreupan to the root *dhreub-*, which is closely allied to the root *dhreubh-* in Gk. θρύπτω 'break in pieces, soften,' θρύψις 'breaking in pieces, dissolving,' τρύφος 'piece, morsel, lump,' and to *dhreup-* in Lett. *drupt* 'fall to pieces,' *dra'upît* 'crumble,' *drupi* 'fragments.' These are all extended from the root *dhru-* 'mass, lump' in Gk. θραύω 'break in pieces, shiver, soften,' Lith. *su-dru-niti* 'become soft,' etc. Cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. θρύπτω. From *dhru-* comes also *dhreu-s* in Lett. *druska* 'crumb,' Goth. *driusan* 'fall,' Gk. θραῦσμα 'piece.' Cf. Johansson, KZs. 30, 422.

Whether Germ. *dreupan comes from *dhṛb-*, with secondary ablaut, or from *dhreub-*, it may be referred to the root *dher-*. As far as the meaning is concerned, there is no difficulty. We have : 'be firm, clot,' and from a noun 'clot, lump' comes 'fall in lumps, dissolve, drop.' Similarly in the root *dhreus-*. Hence the various meanings : 'blood' (drops), 'sad' (drooping), 'sluggish' (drooping), etc. The like development in meaning appears in Goth. *drauhsna* 'fragment, dropping,' OE. *droge* 'excrement,' from the root *dhrugh-* or *dhruk-*. A root *dhruk-* in the sense of 'firm, hard, dry' occurs in OE. *drýge* 'dry,' ON. *draugr* 'dry wood,' OE. *drūgoð* 'dryness, dry ground,' *drūgian* 'dry up'; a synonymous *dhrug-* or perhaps rather *dhrukn-'* in OHG. *trockan*, OS. *drukno*, etc.

5.—The IE. roots *smĕ-, smŏ-*; *smĕ-i-, smŏ-i-, smĭ-*; *smĕ-u-, smō-u-, smŭ-* are found in a large group and with widely diverging meanings. I shall show, however, that all these meanings may develop from a common centre, and that, consequently, there is no semasiological reason for separating them. This common centre is 'rub.' Some of the developments therefrom are : 'rub, wipe off, wash, cleanse'; 'rubbed, caressed, pleased, smile' or 'rub, smear, anoint, shine, smile'; 'rub, smear, defile'; 'rub,

stroke, strike, throw'; 'rub, wear away, consume, burn.' From these the various shades are easily derived. For the connection of these roots compare Persson, Wurzelerw. 10 f., 65, 155, 181[1].

From *smĕ-* we find Gk. σμάω, σμῆν 'rub, smear, anoint, wipe, wash off, cleanse'; σμήχω 'rub, wipe off, clean'; σμώχω 'rub, rub to pieces, grind down'; σμῶδιξ 'bruise'; OHG. *smāhi*<*smĕ-kịo-*, Lat. *macer*<*mɔkro-*, Gk. μακεδνός, OHG. *gi-smāhteōn* (cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. σμῆν, etc., and Noreen, UL. 207). Here perhaps also OE. *smacian* 'pat,' whence the idea of sound as in *smack*, and then 'to smack the lips in eating, eat, taste, smell,' as in OE. *smæcc* 'taste,' OHG. *smecken* 'taste,' MHG. *smecken* 'taste, try, smell.' The stem from which these came may be written **smɔ-go-* or **smo-go-*. From a stem **smĕ-lo-*, **smɔ-lo-* come OHG. *smal*, OE. *smæl* 'small, slender,' Gk. μῆλον 'small animal, sheep, goat,' etc. Cf. Prellwitz or Kluge, Et. Wb. Here too may belong the IE. stem *sme-ro-* 'rub, smear.'

The root *smĭ-*, which is plainly an outgrowth of *smĕ-*, shows the same development in meaning. We may therefore assume that this differentiation took place in the simple root, at least in its main features, though, of course, the enlarged form *smĭ-* has specialized meanings. Moreover, the compound roots *smĭl-*, *smĭr-*, *smĭd-*, *smĭt-*, *smĭg-*, *smĭk-* have significations that are the same as those of *smĭ-* or are easily derivable therefrom. For *smĕ-* and *smĭ-*, therefore, we may claim an IE. origin, but the developed roots *smĭl-*, *smĭd-*, etc., are not necessarily IE. roots— that is, roots that were formed during the IE. unity—but may have developed in the separate dialects. The evidence, however, is only negative.

The meanings 'rub, smite, cut' are found in *smĭ-*, *smĭl-*, *smĭd-*, *smĭt-*; as, Gk. σμινύη 'hoe,' σμίλη 'knife,' Goth. *smeitan* 'smear,' *-smiþa* 'smith.' Of course, these are plainly derivatives of *smĭ-*, but I set them down as separate roots because I believe that is the process of root-formation. In other words, there is no more reason for dividing Gk. σμίλη into a root *smĭ-* and suffix *-lo-*, *-lā-* than to make the same division for Goth. *smeitan*, *smĭ-+-do-*.

The significations 'smile, laugh' and the closely related 'flatter' are seen in *smĭ-*, *smĭl-*, *smĭr-*, *smĭd-*, *smĭg-*; as, Skt. *smáyatē* 'smiles, blushes,' *smáyam* 'astonishment,' Eng. *smile*, Lat. *mīrus*, Gk. μειδάω 'smile,' MHG. *smeichen*. So we might take any meaning, and show how it appears in the enlarged roots. But it is interesting also to note how the same root is used in widely

different senses. For example, *smīd-*, *smeid-* occurs in Goth. *bi-smeitan* 'besmear,' i. e. 'rub,' OChSl. *smědŭ* 'dark brown,' i. e. 'smeared, made filthy,' Prus. *smaidit* 'flatter,' i. e. 'stroke, caress,' *smaida* 'smile,' Gk. μειδάω 'smile.' (Cf. Uhlenbeck, Et. Wb., s. v. *bismeitan*, and Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. μειδάω.)

It is usual to refer these words to *smī-* 'rub' and *smī-* 'smile,' but it is as certain as anything can be that these roots are one. Moreover, we see a regular development in the root *smeid-* from 'rub' to 'smile'[1]; from 'rub' to 'defile' (OE. *smītan*); from 'rub' to '*smite*'; from 'rub' to 'throw' (*schmeissen*). All of these significations are found in Germ. except 'smile.' That this did not develop is purely accidental. There is nothing in the primary meaning that would exclude it, as we have seen. Nevertheless, it is not certain that these words all go back to a common *smeid-*. This may have been formed independently in Gk., Slav., and Germ. from an inherited *smĕi-*. That certainly was IE., *smeid-* probably was not, though it may have belonged to the western unity.

That we find *smīd-*, *smīl-*, *smīr-*, etc., with the same or related meanings in different languages, while *smīd-* or *smīl-* has widely diverging significations, is due to the difference in development, not to the difference in origin. However, we saw that the differentiation in meaning took place in the root *smĕi-*, hence probably in the time of the IE. unity.

Other examples of derivatives of *smei-* are Gk. σμῑκρός 'small' ('rubbed down'), Lat. *mīca* 'crumb,' *mīcidus* 'tiny' (Prellwitz, Et. Wb.); OE. *smicer* 'elegant, beautiful' ('rubbed, polished'), OHG. *smeckar*, MHG. *smeichen* 'flatter' ('caress'), *smicke*, *sminke* 'paint, rouge' ('something rubbed on, smear'), MLG. *smēken* 'beseech' (Kluge, Et. Wb.). The root in the last group is *smĕi-g-*, which is certainly much more closely related to the *smĕi-k* of σμῑκρός than the latter is to the *smē-k-* of OHG. *smāhi*. There is no reason for referring OHG. *smāhi* to a root *smēik-*, as in Brugmann, Grd. I² 486. Such comparisons are based, I believe, on a wrong assumption.

The root *smĕu-* develops from 'rub' the meanings 'rub away, consume, burn'; 'smear, slip, creep, glide, penetrate.' Examples are: Gk. σμύχω 'cause to smoulder or waste away,' ἐσμύγην 'smouldered away,' OE. *smēocan* 'smoke,' Lith. *smáugiu* 'smother,'

---

[1] On this development of meaning cf. OHG. *flitarezzen* 'caress' : MHG. *vlittern* 'laugh quietly.'

Brugmann, Grd. I² 745; Gk. σμοιός, σμυός 'sullen, angry' ('aufgerieben'), Russ. *smuryj* 'dark grey,' Čech. *šmouřiti* 'cloud over, be overcast' (Prellwitz), with which compare LG. *smoren* 'fry, smother,' OE. *smorian* 'smother,' MdE. *smorđer* 'steam.' The same base *smŭ-* with the suffix *-lo-* occurs in Dan. *smul* 'dust,' Du. *smeulen* 'smoulder,' MdE. *smul, smel* 'smell,' and also MHG. *smollen* 'sulk, smile,' *smielen* 'smile,' if the ablaut here is not secondary. From *smeu-q-* come Lith. *smùkti* 'glide,' OChSl. *smykati sę* 'slip, creep,' OE. *smūga* 'creep, penetrate gradually,' *smēan* 'investigate,' MHG. *smiegen*, etc. Cf. Kluge, Et. Wb., s. v. *schmiegen.*

6.—The IE. root *tĕ̯o-, tŭ-* 'swell, sway,' from which are the derived roots *tu̯e-ro-, tu̯e-lo-, tu̯e-to*, etc., written below *tu̯ĕr-, tu̯ĕl-*, etc., occurs in a large number of words with widely divergent meanings. Though it may be impossible to show a logical connection between any two meanings, it is not difficult to trace the development of any one of the various significations from the common centre.

I give the primary meaning of this root as 'swell, sway,' as 'swell' does not entirely express what must have been the germ idea, or at least the idea that very soon developed therefrom. For the root formed many words expressing the swelling or rising of water, the swelling or growth of plants, etc., and hence the idea of 'swaying, rolling.'

To the simple root *tū-* we may assign OChSl. *tyjǫ, tyti* 'get fat,' Skt. *táviti* 'be strong,' Lat. *tueor* 'protect, guard, watch, observe, look at,' OS. *thau*, OE. *þeaw* 'observance, custom, habit,' Goth. *þius* 'servant' ('observer, guard'), Fick, VWb.⁴, 445. Here also OE. *þāwian*, OHG. *douwen* 'thaw,' primarily 'swell, flow.' Compare also OE. *þawenian* 'moisten' and Lith. *tvìnti* 'swell' (of water). These and allied meanings are found in the various compound roots given below, and from these meanings the numerous other significations are easily derivable.

From *tu̯en-* 'swell' come the following: Lith. *tvìnti* 'swell, rise,' *tvanùs* 'overflowing,' *tvãnas* 'flood,' OHG. *donēn* 'swell,' Fick, VWb.⁴ I 449. Probably here rather than to *ten-*, OE. *þunian* 'be prominent or erect, be proud.' In *donēn, þunian* the roots *tu̯en-* and *ten-* have fallen together.

Similarly *tu̯em-, tŭm-* in Lat. *tumeō, tumulus*, Skt. *tumra* 'swelling,' *tumala* 'tumult,' Lat. *tumultus*, Av. *tūma* 'strong,' OE.

þūma 'thumb,' OHG. *dūmo*, etc. Cf. Fick, VWb.⁴ I 61 f., 445. These are generally regarded as derivatives of *tŭ-* 'swell.' With equal right we may explain the roots given below as outgrowths of *tŭ-*.

The IE. root *tu̯ĕr-* furnishes an interesting variety of meanings, but wherever it occurs it may be one and the same. For all these meanings are easily brought together. Primarily it signified 'swell, sway.' From this come several lines of development about as follows: 'Swell, sway, whirl, go rapidly; whirl, stir, beat; whirl, twist up, confine, hold.' The ideas expressed by each of these words may be further increased according as the verb is used transitively or intransitively, and, of course, each meaning may shade off into many others. The same word, indeed, may express ideas that have come through different lines of development. It is therefore not possible to tell, in every case, just how a particular signification arose.

To begin with the meaning 'swell,' we may mention as derivatives of *tu̯er-*: Lat. *torus* 'swelling, bulge, brawn, bed,' for **tu̯oros*, like *tesqua*<**tu̯esquā*, Brugmann, Grd. I² 321; OE. *þēor* 'inflammation'; Lat. *turgeo* 'swell'; OE. *þrēat* 'crowd, troop, violence, threat,' *þrūtian* 'swell with pride or anger, threaten,' ON. *þrútenn* 'swollen,' MHG. *strotzen*. From 'swell' developed 'crowd, thrust' in the related Lat. *trūdō* 'thrust,' Goth. *þriutan* 'urge, trouble,' OHG. *driozan*, etc. The Lat. *trū-* and the Germ. *þrū-* in this root *trūd-* may come from **tu̯rd-*. Cf. Brugmann, Grd. I² 260, where OE. *þrȳþ*, ON. *þrúðr* are compared with Lith. *tvirtas* 'firm,' *tveriù* 'hold.' The meanings of OE. *þrȳþ*, 'strength, might, troop, host, body (of water), copiousness,' come much better from the original meaning 'swell.' Notice also OE. *þrymm* 'multitude, host, strength, renown,' Lat. *turma*, Fick, VWb.⁴ I 449.

That the Germ. root *þrŭ-t-* came from *tu̯r̥-d-* is shown by the development of OE. *þweran*. The participles are *þworen, þuren, þrūen, þroren*. Of these *þuren* and *þrūen* are from pre-Germ. **turonós* and **tu̯r̥onós*, while *þworen* has introduced its *w* from *þweran*, and *þroren* is a blend of **þoren*, the original of *þworen*, and *þrūen*. The form *þrofen*, which is also given, is either from an enlarged root **tu̯erp-* or **tu̯erbh-*, or else the *f* is a late writing for *w*, which is more probable.

It is impossible to say whether, in certain cases, this *trŭ-* (*þrŭ-*) is from *tu̯ĕr-* or *ter-*. For example, OE. *þrēapian* 'rebuke,'

þriepel 'instrument of punishment' may be the derived root *tu̯er-b*
in Lat. *turba*, etc. Of course the ablaut in that case, as in Goth.
þriutan, etc., is secondary.

It is quite possible that Lat. *trūdō*, Goth. *þriutan* may be from
a root *trŭ-, treu-* from *ter-*, just as *sreu-* from *ser-*. In that case
the two Germ. roots *þrū-*, from *tu̯er-* and *treu-*, have fallen
together. Germ. *þrū-*, in the sense 'swell,' goes back, I should
say, to the root *tu̯er-*. In the sense 'press, oppress' it may
represent *treu-*. In any case we may compare OE. *þrěa*, OHG.
drō 'threat,' OE. *þrēan* 'rebuke, reprove, oppress, punish,
threaten,' with Gk. τρύω 'wear out, distress, vex.' It is the ablaut,
however, and not the meaning, that causes a doubt.

Germ. *þrū-*<*tu̯ěr-* occurs, in all probability, in OE. *þrūh* 'water-
pipe, trough; basket, coffin,' OHG. *drūh* 'fetter, trap,' from which
MHG. *driuhen* 'catch,' OHG. *drucchen*, OE. *þryccan* 'press,'
ON. *þrūga* 'press.' All of these I derive from a pre-Germ.
*trū-qᵘo-<**tu̯r̥-qᵘo-* from the root *tu̯er-* in the derived significa-
tion 'entwine, bind in, confine, hold,' and compare with Gk. ταρπός
'basket,' σάρπος 'chest,' and further, with Prellwitz, with σορός 'urn
to hold the ashes of the dead, coffin.'

That *tu̯ěr-*, the base of the various groups, is one and the same
is apparent from a mere glance at the intertwining meanings in
the different languages. The most common meaning, it will be
seen, is 'whirl, turn,' from which comes either 'hasten, rush' or
'turn, form' or 'turn, roll up, entwine, confine' or 'turn, stir,
confuse.' And all of these develop, as explained above, from
'swell, sway.' As examples of this varied development may be
given: Lat. *torus* 'a swelling' (cf. above), Gk. σωρός 'heap' (Prell-
witz), Germ. *þrū-* in OE. *þrȳþ, þrūtian*, etc.; OHG. *dweran*
'whirl, stir, mix,' OE. *þweran* 'stir, churn, beat (metal), forge,'
ON. *þuara*, OHG. *dwiril*, OE. *þwirel*, Lat. *trua* 'a stirring spoon,'
trulla 'ladle' (Noreen, UL. 224); Gk. τῡρός 'cheese,' τῡρίω 'stir
up, make cheese,' with which compare again OE. *þweran* 'stir,
churn,' *þwǣre* 'a churn, olive press,' Serv. *tvoriti* 'make, form'
(e. g. cheese), *tvorilo* 'cheese-mould,' OSl. *tvoriti* 'make,' *tvorŭ*
'form,' Lith. *tvérti* 'enclose, hold,' *su-tvérti* 'create' (Schade);
MLG. *dweren* 'run about,' Skt. *tvárate* 'hastens,' *turáṇas* 'hasten-
ing,' Gk. ὀτρύνω 'urge on,' ὀτραλέος 'nimble' (Brugmann, Grd. I²
260); OE. *ā-þrȳd* 'taken away,' cf. Lith. *tvérti* 'seize.'

The meanings as given above show a regular development, and
it is impossible to draw any hard and fast line between the various

significations. For example, OE. *þrūh*, in the sense 'water-pipe, trough' may be rather from the original meaning 'swell, gush forth,' as perhaps also in Gk. σῦρ-ιγξ 'pipe,' Skt. *tur-ṇāça* 'cataract.' Compare also Gk. συρμαία 'emetic' (and τρύξ 'must, dregs, dross,' τάργανον 'vinegar'?).

To *tu̯ĕr*- belong Goth. *þwairho* 'angry,' i. e. 'cross,' OE. *þweorh* 'adverse, perverse, angry,' OHG. *dwerah*. Cf. Brugmann, Grd. I² 540, and Kluge, Et. Wb., s. v. *Zwerch*-. Perhaps with Kluge we may add here Lat. *torqueo*. This, then, would be from the same root as Gk. ταρπός, σάρπος, OE. *þrūh*, OHG. *drūh*, etc., as given above. We might compare further Gk. τραπέω 'tread grapes,' like Lat. *torcular* from *torqueo*. A stem *þwera*- with a similar meaning occurs in ON. *þuerr*, OHG. *twer* 'crosswise.' Just as 'wine-press' has developed from *tu̯er-q*-, so from the simpler root *tu̯ĕr*- comes OE. *þwǣre* 'churn, (olive-)press.' Here also belongs Gk. σαρά-πους 'having turned-out feet' (cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb.), and here I should place τρά-πεζα 'table.' There is no proof that this is for *τ(ε)τρα-πεζα 'four-footed,' as usually explained. Indeed, its use points the other way. It may be any flat surface, as 'the crossbench in which the mast is fixed,' 'a tablet for inscriptions,' etc. If we derive the first syllable τρα-<*tu̯r̥*- from the root *tu̯ĕr*-, τρά-πεζα was named from the fact that it consisted of a plank across supports, 'a thwart, transtrum.' This τρα- we may compare with OE. *þroc*<*tu̯r̥-go-m* 'piece of timber on which the plough-share is fixed' and also 'table.'

Other examples of derivatives of *tu̯ĕr*- are: OE. *þwearm* 'cutting-instrument,' cf. *þweran* 'beat (metal), forge'; *ge-þwǣre* 'harmonious,' primarily 'turning together'; OE. *þyrs*, ON. *þurs* 'giant, demon,' perhaps Gk. τύραννος<*τυρασνος, from *tu̯ĕr*- 'swell, become large, powerful'; Lat. *turiō* 'sprout,' *tuer*- 'swell, spring up'; Lat. *turunda* 'ball of paste, roll of lint,' *tuer*- 'roll up'; OHG. *stōran* 'destroy,' OE. *styrian* 'stir, excite,' OHG. *sturm*, OE. *storm* 'storm, uproar, battle,' cf. OE. *þrymm* 'strength, troop,' ON. *þrymr* 'noise,' Lat. *turma*, Gk. συρμός 'anything that tears along with violence,' σύρω 'treat with violence, drag along,' OHG. *dweran* 'turn rapidly,' etc.; OE. *ge-þwĕor* 'curds,' cf. *þweran* 'churn,' Gk. τυρός 'cheese'; OE. *þrotu*<*tu̯r̥-dā*- 'throat,' perhaps in the sense 'swell, gush forth, spout,' the throat being a 'spout'; possibly here Gk. τράχηλος 'throat' from *tu̯r̥gh*-, cf. Lat. *turgeō* 'swell,' from which meaning would come 'gush forth.' OE. *þrintan*, MHG. *drinden* 'to swell' probably represent a

Germ. root *þrunt-*, a nasalized form of *þrūt-*, as in OE. *ā-þrūtan* 'to swell,' ON. *þrūtenn* 'swollen.' The pres. *þrintan* was re-formed from the part. *þruntan*.

A related root *tu̯el-* occurs with similarly developed meanings. Examples are: Gk. τύλη 'swelling, lump, pad, cushion' (cf. Lat. *torus* from *tu̯er-*), τυλίσσω 'roll up,' Skt. *tūlam* 'tuft,' OChSl. *tylŭ* 'neck.' Cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. τύλη. OChSl. *tylŭ* may have developed through the meaning 'turn' or 'spout.' In the latter case we may compare OHG. *dola* 'pipe, drain,' Gk. σωλήν 'pipe, channel' (Brugmann, Grd. I² 310), and also ON. *þylr* 'noise,' *þulr* 'speaker,' OE. *ge-þyll* 'breeze,' *þyle* 'orator, buffoon, jester.' Cf. under *tu̯er-* OE. *þrūh*, Gk. σῦριγξ, σῦρίζω 'pipe, whistle.' To *tu̯el-* certainly belong Gk. σάλος 'swell, surge, rolling, disquiet,' σαλάκων 'swaggerer, boaster,' which Prellwitz leaves doubtful, and probably also συλάω 'take away,' σῦλον 'booty.' This meaning developed the same as in Lith. *tvérti* 'seize.' From *tu̯el-* in the sense 'swell, spring forth, shoot up' come words for 'sprout, shoot, peg,' like Lat. *turiō* from *tu̯er-*. Such a meaning we find in Gk. τύλος 'lump, knob, knot, wooden nail or bolt used in shipbuilding, a spindle.' With this compare Lith. *tulìs* 'eine dille am wagen, ein stecksel in der achse des wagens, ein stecksel in der seite des ruderkahns zum festanlegen des grossen ruders'; OE. *þol* 'thole, oar-peg, rowlock,' ON. *þollr* 'sapling, thole.' Here perhaps also NHG. *dille, tülle*, MHG. *tülle* from OHG. **dulli*, stem **dulja-* < **tulio̯-*, like Lith. *tulìs*. This stem **tulio̯-* would mean 'belonging to a peg or stake,' or 'a collection of stakes,' which would give the double meaning of MHG. *tülle*. Or the double meaning could come from the original force of *tu̯el-* 'swell, spout out' and 'swell, spring forth,' as in Gk. σωλήν 'channel, pipe' and τύλος 'peg, bolt.' MHG. *tülle* would, in case it comes from the root *tu̯el-*, be connected with OHG. *dola* 'pipe, drain.' Cf. Wilmanns, DGr. I, p. 107. Perhaps from *tu̯el-* 'swell' with the developed meaning 'shoot out, beam, gleam' may come Gk. σέλας 'light, brightness.'

Under *teus-, tu̯es-* the primary meaning is also 'swell,' as Skt. *tavas-* 'power,' Goth. **þwasts* 'strong, secure,' from which *ga-þwastjan* and *þwastiþa*. Cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. σάος. From 'strong, powerful' may develop a verb 'overpower,' so we may add here OHG. *thwes-ben* 'destroy, extinguish.' This brings us to OE. *þeostre, þiestre* 'dark,' *ge-þuxod* 'dark' (from **-þusc-*), OLG. *thiustri*. The idea 'empty, desert' in Lat. *tesqua*, Skt. *tuccha-* 'empty, void,' OChSl. *tŭštŭ* 'empty,' *is-tŭštiti* 'evacuare,'

tŭšteta 'damnum' (cf. Brugmann, Grd. I² 321; Miklosich, Et. Wb.), is closely allied to that in *thwesben* and in *þeostre*. This idea may have originated as I suggest or perhaps rather from 'swell, gush forth, empty.' However it arose, we may compare further OE. *post*, OHG. *dost* 'dung.' Cf. *is-tŭštiti* above, and for meaning Lat. *alvum evacuare*.

From 'swell, fill, satisfy' come Skt. *tuṣyati* 'is satisfied, pleased, become quiet,' *tuṣṭi* 'satisfaction,' *tūṣṇīm* 'silently.' For this double development from 'swell'—'become empty' : 'become full'—compare Skt. *çvávati* 'swells; becomes empty, hollow' : 'becomes full, strong.'

From 'swell, spring up, spring forth, be excited, excite' developed the meanings in the following: ON. *þysia*, *þyria* 'rush forth,' *þyss*, *þausn* 'tumult,' OE. *þys* 'storm,' OHG. *dōsōn*, MHG. *dōsen* 'tosen,' *diusen* 'become confused; pull, worry,' OChSl. *tŭštati* 'urge,' *tŭštivŭ* 'busy, active.' But slightly different from these in development are Lith. *tvaskinu* 'beat violently,' *tvaskoju* 'flicker,' *tvasku* 'gleam; chatter.' Perhaps here OE. *þwastrian* 'whisper.'

From 'swell, exhale' comes Lat. *tūs* 'incense,' with which compare OHG. *dosto* 'wild thyme.' Phonetically the same is MHG. *doste* 'tuft, bunch.' This is perhaps rather from the idea 'swell, grow.' Compare OE. *þūf* 'tuft,' below.

Teup- (*tu̯ep-*), *teubh-*, *teub-*. Here occur the usual significations. Lat. *tūber* 'swelling, tumor, excrescence, mushroom' may perhaps be from *tūbher-* rather than *tūmr-*, as explained by Brugmann, Grd. I² 369. We may at least assume the meaning 'swell' here as in the other groups. Possibly here belongs Lat. *teba* 'hill,' from *tu̯ebā*.—From 'swell, spout out': Lat. *tubus* 'water-pipe, trumpet,' *tuba* 'trumpet,' and probably *tibia<*toubia* 'pipe, flute, shin-bone.' Compare *līber<*loub-*, Brugmann, Grd. I² 107.—From 'swell, grow': OE. *þūf* 'tuft, banner,' *ge-þūf* 'leafy, luxuriant,' *þūft* 'thicket,' *þȳfel* 'bush, thicket,' *tūp-* or *tubh-*. Here perhaps Lith. *túba, tūbà* 'felt.'

The root *teup-* occurs in the sense 'bend over, cower.' This probably developed from 'spring forth, project' and then 'cower' as in Lith. *tursóti* 'mit vorgestrecktem Hintern dastehen, kauern.' This root *teup-* appears in Lith. *tupéti* 'crouch, cower,' OE. *þoft*, OHG. *dofta*, ON. *þopta* 'rower's bench,' OE. *ge-þofta*, OHG. *gi-dofta* 'companion,' Goth. *þiufs* 'thief,' etc. Cf. Kluge, Et. Wb., s. v. *Ducht* and *Dieb*. Here too, with prefixed *s-*, belong

OE. *stūpian<*stūpn-*' 'stoop, curve downwards,' ON. *stūpa*,
ODn. *stuypen* 'stoop,' MHG. *stopfen* 'conceal,' *stüpfen* 'depart
secretly, OE. *ā-stīepan* 'bereave, deprive,' OHG. *stiufen* 'bereave,'
stiof-, OE. *stēop-*, ON. *stiúp*, ONorw. *stýp-* and *stýf-* 'step-.' The
ONorw. *stýf-* shows that the *-p-* in the above group goes back to
pre-Germ. *-pn-'*. If *tup-* 'stoop' and *tup-* 'steal' go together,
certainly *stup-* 'stoop' and *stup-* 'conceal, deprive' should also
be connected. We may arrange the words in the order in which
the meanings developed, as follows: Lith. *tupéti* 'crouch, cower,'
OE. *stūpian* 'stoop'; MHG. *stopfen* 'conceal,' *stüpfen* 'depart
secretly'; Goth. *þiubjō* 'secretly,' *þiufs* 'thief'; OE. *ā-stīepan*
'deprive, bereave'; *stēop-* 'step-.'

The roots *teut-*, *teud-*, *teudh-* are like the others in meaning.
Examples are: OHG. *diozan* 'swell, rise, roar,' OE. *þeotan* 'howl,'
MHG. *dieze* 'cataract,' OHG. *duz* 'flood, torrent, noise,' Skt.
tudāmi 'thrust,' Lat. *tundō*, Goth. *stautan*, Gk. Τυδεύς 'Hammer,'
OE. *ā-þȳtan* 'expel.'

The *s* in Goth. *stautan* is supposed to have belonged originally
to the root. I think it was rather an addition which is due to its
having taken on the meaning 'shove, thrust.' Other words of
similar import which might have caused *teud-* to become *steud-*
are Goth. *stigqan, -stiggan, -skiuban, slahan*, etc.

'Swell' must have been the original meaning, for from this it is
easy to explain the other significations. If we start with 'strike,
beat,' we should hardly get to 'swell,' but the reverse development
is plain to see. Thus: 'Swell; spring forth; cause to spring
forth, thrust; beat,' etc. 'Strike,' as we see below under *tueq-*,
could also develop as follows: 'Swell; a swelling, knob, peg,
stake,' and then to hit with such a weapon. The idea of 'noise'
may arise in various ways, according to the application of the
original meaning 'swell.' In OE. *þeote* 'water-pipe, channel, tor-
rent, cataract' the primary force of the root is very evident. It
proves also that the meaning 'pipe, tube' occurring so frequently
in derivatives from the root *tū-* meant primarily 'spout,' that from
which something spouts out, and not 'hole.' The idea of
'hollowness' might and did arise, but that was secondary.

From a pre-Germ. *tuēt-* comes OHG. *ki-thuuathit*, gl. K., *ca-
duadit*, Pa., 'exaggerat,' i. e. 'swell, heap up.' From a similarly
formed *teut-* comes Goth. *þiuda* 'people,' from 'swell, grow.' Cf.
OHG. *liotan* 'grow' : *liut* 'people.' Here or to *teudh-* belongs
OE. *þoden* 'whirlwind, whirlpool,' from 'swell, rise, roar,' as in

OHG. *diozan, duz.* A nasalized form of this root appears in OS. *bi-thwindan* 'contendere,' Ess. gl., and perhaps in OE. *þindan* 'swell, be angry,' with secondary ablaut formed from the part. *þunden.* To *tu̯edh-* 'swell' may be referred Gk. σάθη· ἀνδρὸς αἰδοῖον, Prellwitz, Et. Wb., and with this we may compare Lat. *testis* < **tu̯edh-stis,* or *testis* may be from the root *tu̯es-* 'swell.'

The root *tu̯eq-* shows the same variation in meaning. Thus: Lith. *tukti* 'become fat,' *táukas* 'fat,' Lett. *tukt* 'swell, get fat,' OHG. *dioh,* OE. *þeoh* 'thigh' (Schade, Wb., s. v. *dioh*); Gk. σῶκος 'strong' (cf. Prellwitz, Wb.), OE. *þyhtig* 'strong.' As in Lith. *tvérti* 'enclose' and Gk. τυλίσσω 'roll up,' so here we find the meaning 'enclose, confine' in Gk. σηκός 'fold, stall,' σάττω 'press upon, pack, load,' OHG. *dwingan* 'compress, repress,' *dûhen,* OE. *þȳn* 'press.' (Cf. Brugmann, Grd. I² 311, and Kluge, Et. Wb., s. v. *zwingen.*)

We see here how the various significations branch out and intertwine. For example, the meanings of *dwingan* could come from 'enclose, confine' or from 'cause to swell, stuff.' The latter seems to be the case with OHG. *dwang* 'constipation.' At any rate, Lith. *tvenkiù, tvènkti* 'cause to swell, dam up' corresponds better phonetically with OHG. *dwingan* than does Gk. σηκός < **tu̯āqos.* Cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. σάττω. This is a good example for the development of the meanings 'compress, repress, suppress' from 'swell.' Notice also OE. *þȳn* 'press, stab.' This shows us the connection of this Germ. root further with OChSl. *tykati* 'pungere, tangere,' *tŭkalo* 'cuspis' (mark this), *tŭknǫti* 'pungere, pulsare,' *is-tukati* 'sculpere,' Gk. τυκίζω 'dress stones,' τύκος 'pick, hammer, battle-ax,' τυκάνη 'flail.' Cf. Prellwitz, Et. Wb., s. v. τυκάνη. The meanings we have here develop also from 'swell,' as follows: 'swell; anything swollen; lump, knob, point.' From this, then, were formed denominatives signifying 'to strike with a lump, knob, point,' that is 'to beat, prod, stab, cut.' For this development compare Gk. τύλη 'any swelling or lump,' τύλος 'knob, knot, wooden nail, bolt,' and Germ. *drepan* 'strike, slay,' above.

From OE. *þȳn* 'press, stab' we may infer a pre-Germ. **tŭko-* or **tŭnko-* 'swelling, knob, point, peg,' corresponding to Gk. τύκος, OChSl. *tŭkalo.* Here I should add MHG. *zwec,* which is doubtless for **twec* from OHG. **dweck* 'zweck,' pre-Germ. **tu̯eknó-.* In MHG. *zwiken* 'nail, fasten'; 'pull, twitch' two roots have fallen together, Germ. *þwekk-* and *twekk-.* This

division I make not on account of the meaning, but because of OE. *twiccan* 'twitch,' which can not be separated from MHG. *zwiken* 'twitch.'

To *tчeq-* belongs also OHG. *thungida<*tunq-'* 'instar, similitudo.' Compare OChSl. *is-tukati* 'sculpere,' *is-tukanŭ* 'idolum.'

The same development of meaning occurs in the root *tчer-*, as in OChSl. *tvoriti* 'make,' *tvorŭ* 'form, shape.'

From *tчeq-* in the developed sense 'strike, stroke, rub' comes Goth. *þwahan* 'wash.' Compare OChSl. *tykati* 'pungere, tangere,' and notice the meanings in Germ. that point back to 'stroke, rub': OE. *þwēan* 'wash, anoint,' *þwēal, þwæhl* 'washing, ointment,' OHG. *dwahila* 'manutergium.' Cf. author, Jour. Germ. Phil., vol. II, 227 f.

From the meaning 'enclose' as seen in Gk. σηκός 'fold,' OHG. *dwingan*, etc., we come to 'protect, cover,' as in Skt. *tvac-, tvacas-* 'covering, hide, skin,' Gk. σάκος 'shield.' Cf. Brugmann, Grd. I² 310. Perhaps more closely connected here than with *dwingan* are OE. *þwang* 'thong,' *þweng* 'band,' ON. *þwengr* 'thong.'

Other examples are: OChSl. *tŭkati* 'weave,' primarily 'strike the web,' as in Gk. κρέκω 'strike, beat : weave'; Gk. σήκωμα 'weight, sacred enclosure,' cf. σῶκος 'strong' and σηκός 'enclosure'; OE. *ge-þuhtsum* 'abundant,' cf. *þyhtig* 'strong'; Skt. *tōká* 'creation, progeny,' *túc* 'progeny,' *tvakṣati* 'forms, fashions,' cf. Gk. τυκίζω, etc.

Other roots ending in a palatal or velar: Skt. *tōçatē* 'drip'; *túj* 'quick, strong,' *tuj* 'move violently, swing, urge, thrust,' with which compare OE. *þocerian* 'run about' and the nasalized Skt. *tvaṅgati* 'leaps.'

Now, if the roots *tчer-, tчel-*, etc., do not come from *tu-* 'swell,' there is at least no semasiological reason for thinking the contrary. In fact, if that were the only consideration, the evidence would be altogether in favor of connecting them. Whatever specialized meaning we take from any one root, we can find its parallel in most of the other roots considered here as outgrowths of *tu-*. It is evident, therefore, that the signification of a word is a variable element, and can not of itself be used to prove or disprove an etymology.

<div align="right">FRANCIS A. WOOD.</div>

III.—SERVIUS AND THE SCHOLIA OF DANIEL.

PART I.

The determination of the relation of the two masses of comments passing under the name of Servius is dependent upon an analysis of the language used by each. Little can be gained from a consideration of the facts they present. When the comments were written there were in existence large masses of critical material, at the disposal of any writer who wished to make use of them, so that sameness or similarity in facts stated really indicates nothing more than that the writers had access to the same sources. However, two considerations seem to have an application to Servius: comments in which the Scholia merely repeat, in the same or slightly varied language, the statements of Servius indicate the absence of the unifying work of a single writer; comments containing varied or even antagonistic statements may indicate an attempt of a single writer to present, in outline or entirety, all the views with which he had met. But as these are not sufficient for the settlement of the authorship of the comments, we are thrown back upon facts of language independent of the opinions presented. This must be the line of investigation, unless we practically abandon the question by assuming that the Servius merely presents the statements of the sources followed. Nothing is settled by this, for all questions under discussion referring to the Servius are in this way transferred to the sources themselves.

'Servius' may be considered as the work of different writers; as works derived by different writers from the same sources, or as an abridged and unabridged edition of the same work. The last two theories are dependent for their support on the proof of the homogeneity of language in the two masses of comments, for in either case the derivative work must have the same elements as its source.

In the following paper is given a partial consideration of some facts presented by the vocabulary in the Servius and the Scholia with the design of applying these facts in a discussion of the homogeneity of the language in the two works. While statistics

are not proof absolute in questions of authorship where only a few
points are involved, where there is a very noticeable divergence
on many points, statistics must have considerable weight. But
mere number of occurrences must be reduced to a common base.
The occurrence, in the two commentaries, of a large number of
expressions, especially *etiam* and *scilicet*, each occurring hundreds
of times in both, with the ratio of three to one, indicates that that
must be about the ratio of the mass of the two commentaries.
The careful measurement of the ems on several score of pages in
different parts indicates about the same ratio. Bearing this in
mind we may consider that where the ratio, excepting in the case
of expressions occurring but a few times, where ratios are of no
value, varies much from 3 : 1 there may be held to be a different
attitude on the part of the two commentaries toward that expres-
sion. This must be constantly borne in mind, for the disproof of
the homogeneity of expression does not depend on the establish-
ment of the fact of complete dissimilarity in form of expression,
but on the establishment of the fact that the habitual choice of
form of expression by one is in many instances decidedly different
from that of the other. As the comments are on the same sub-
jects, it is not at all remarkable that there is great similarity in the
two vocabularies. But with this similarity there are numerous
most striking dissimilarities which can not be explained except
upon the basis of different authorship for the two masses of
comments.

The divisions in the following paper are not in all cases abso-
lutely exact, as it has been found convenient at times to put into
some divisions some terms which in a closer analysis would be
placed by themselves. But as the design is to present some of
the general features of the vocabulary in the two masses of com-
ments, the division into parts is sufficiently exact for that purpose.
Repeated examinations of the entire mass in working out the
different phases presented have given to the results as much
accuracy as can be hoped for where the text itself must depend
to some extent upon the work of the editor.

The comments are referred to as S. and D., the latter standing
for those not found in the Servian codices, and figures given (:)
indicate the number of occurrences of different expressions in
each. Merely for convenience, D. is spoken of as if it were the
work of a single writer, even though evidence is presented indi-
cating that it is by different men. The design is to compare the

19

masses of comments, and at only a few points will the usage of some of the MSS be mentioned.

I.—Personal Element.

A. *References to Commentator.*—1. *First Person Singular.*

In two passages S. refers to a preceding comment using the first person of the perfect indicative: 11, 886[1] ut supra dixi; B. Praef. (p. 4, 10) sicut supra dixi. There are four other passages in S. where the first person of the verb is used referring to the commentator: 1, 258 ut si dicas 'legi oratorem' nec addas quem, intelligo Ciceronem; 1, 417 si autem sertos dixero, addo flores, si sertas, addo coronas; 3, 182 nam expertum rerum si dixero, significo peritum; si expertem, ignarum; 10, 341 quando dico 'moriturus est' vere moriturus est. In D., the use of the first person is confined to the comments on B. and G., excepting 1, 651 nescio quibus disciplinis; and 11, 247 vi nescio qua. Parenthetic *ut puto* occurs twice: G. 3, 3 legitur et 'carmine,' et, ut puto, rectius; G. 3, 296 sed, ut puto, 'mox' abundat. The other passages where *puto* is used are G. 2, 333 an ideo non metuit, quia non surgunt? quod magis puto; G. 4, 219 sed ego puto simpliciter referri sententias philosophorum. Only one passage does not have *puto*, and there S. also has the present: B. 8, 4 quiesco enim *duplicem habet significationem et aliter dico* ' *quiesco* ego,' aliter 'quiesco servum,' id est quiescere facio. Here the *facio* of S. is merely a part of a general explanation, and is not classed with the ones given above, as are not several passages in which S. explains the words of Vergil; e. g. G. 3, 40 interim georgica scribo; G. 3, 46 postquam georgica scripsero; and some passages in which the words of Vergil are explained as if they had been spoken by some of the characters, e. g. 12, 74 ac si diceret: si imminet, periturus sum, etiam si minime ad bella proficiscar; B. 7, 36 si tot agnos habuero quot oves.

2. *First Person Plural.*

a. Perfect and Present.—1. *Diximus* (405 : 4).—The references in the Servius to preceding comments are in nearly all cases expressed by *diximus*, most frequently with *supra*, e. g. 1, 175

---

[1] References to the Aeneid do not designate the work, as do those to the Bucolics and Georgics. The text of Thilo-Hagen has been used.

SUCCEPIT pro suscepit, ut diximus supra. A few other particles are used; e. g. 1, 37 et hoc fictum est, ut superius diximus; 1, 231 subaudis filius . . . ut ante diximus; 2, 683 NE QUA qua vacat, ut frequenter diximus; 4, 697 nam, ut saepe diximus, secundum sectas loquitur; 10, 91 et istam historiam quam modo diximus. In many of the passages *ut* only is used; e. g. 1, 286 et omnis poetae intentio, ut in qualitate carminis diximus. In only a comparatively few instances is the passage referred to definitely indicated, though this is more common in the later than in the early portions of the commentary: 2, 592 ut enim in primo diximus; G. 1, 404 de quo plenius in bucolicis diximus; G. 2, 201 ut in Aeneide diximus. *Docuimus* is used G. 1, 488 COMETAE crinitae, pessimae, quia sunt et bonae, ut docuimus in Aeneide. The use of *memoravimus*, excepting 11, 260, is confined to comments on B. and G. (B. Praef., p. 3, 29; B. 6, 61; G. 2, 170; 2, 541; 3, 338). Aside from these verbs there are few others used: *notavimus* 1, 76; *tractavimus* 5, 522; *exposuimus* 6, 132. In D. there are but four similar references: 2, 152; 4, 246 (a repetition of a comment in S.); 10, 164 (*ex uno Turonensi edidit Daniel.*); 10, 423 (*hab. T.*) capillorem diximus, a statement apparently not found elsewhere in the commentary as we have it.

2. *Legimus* (144 : 4).—While the two commentaries do not differ as much in the use of this verb as in the case of *diximus*, the few number of occurrences in D. must be taken as an indication of a different critical attitude toward the material accessible. Two of the statements in D. refer to the words of Vergil, while the two others are general references (2, 512; 12, 144). The statements in S. refer both to passages in Vergil, e. g. 12, 766 legimus enim in Vergilio de tibiis, and in other writers, e. g. G. 4, 218 ut in Sallustio legimus, as well as to the proper reading in the passage under consideration, e. g. 1, 100 et 'sub undis' legimus et 'sub undas'; 4, 9 et 'terret' et 'terrent' legitur. sed si 'terret' legerimus, 'insomnia' erit vigilia. In a great majority of the instances the reference is to an illustrative passage.

3. *Intellegimus* (220 : 10).—This form is used a little more frequently than the last, though the personal element in S. is still much more clearly marked.

4. *Dicimus* (423 : 77).—This form of *dico* is the one most frequently used, and states the usage of the writer as well as of the community in which he lived, e. g. G. 4, 421 et melius 'hic obex,' quam 'haec obex' dicimus; G. 4, 417 in singulari numero

' hoc specus,' in plurali ' hi specus ' dicimus ; B. 1, 32 nam modo servi tantum peculium dicimus.

5. *Accipimus* (79 : 52).—This verb seems to have been a favorite with the writer of D., and the relative number of occurrences is larger than in S., which is the reverse of the usage in the case of other verbs.

6. Other Verbs (632 : 94).—In this list is included a large number of verbs whose meaning has no special significance. In a few, however, the distinction between S. and D. is clearly shown : *Scimus* (S. 27), *invenimus* (S. 23), *significamus* (15 : 1), *novimus* (28 : 2) are the most noticeable of these. They are the ones in which the intellectual element is most prominent, and their greater frequency is in harmony with the general indications of personality shown in S.

In making the divisions the occurrences in both indicative and subjunctive have been counted together, as the same element of personality is involved in both moods. Passages containing infinitives dependent on *possumus* and *debemus* have been classified according to the infinitives, as the entire expression is practically equivalent to a potential.

aa. In only a few passages in S. is the future used where reference is made to the intention of the writer in other parts of his work : 2, 506, speaking of the various theories about the death of Priam, he says : et hanc opinionem plene Vergilius sequitur, ut suo indicabimus loco, a reference to the comment ad v. 557. 5, 498 SUBSEDIT . . . de quo verbo plenius dicturi sumus illo versu (XI 268) devicta Asia subsedit adulter. In two other passages—6, 127 suis locis hic esse comprobabimus ; 6, 140 sic intellegentes removebimus quaestionem—the future refers to what immediately follows.

3. *Perfect Passive.*

Dictum est (2 : 102).—One of the most noticeable differences between the two commentaries is in the use of the perfect passive of *dico* by D. instead of the active form used by S. The favorite form of expression of each is avoided by the other. S. has ut supra dictum est 3, 163, where *diximus* is used in the preceding part of the comment, and B. 1, 2. But the difference in relative frequency is not the only one with reference to the use of the active and passive of *dico*. In S. the references are only to preceding parts of the commentary, showing that it was carefully

developed, each part of the comments dependent only on pre-
ceding parts. The references in D. are to both earlier and later
portions of the work, as though the comments in D. were merely
additions to a mass of comments already existing, and which was
regarded by the writer as a work already completed, at least so
far as the comments of S. were concerned. S., it is true, uses the
future in a few passages, but this only indicates that coming por-
tions of the work were not yet written. Moeller, Quaestiones
Servianae (Kiliae, 1892), p. 33, refers to the passive forms used
by S. as contradicting the statement made by Thilo, Servius, vol.
I, p. xiv, with regard to the personal character of the Servius.
Taking into account the limited number of occurrences of the
personal expression in D. and of the impersonal in S., they can not
be considered as forming a valid basis for an argument showing
that the diction in the two commentaries is alike. It shows that
each might, had he so willed, have used the form chosen by the
other. It is the voluntary selection of different forms from among
a number of forms accessible to each that clearly distinguishes the
two works. A few quotations will show the freedom with which
D. referred to more advanced parts of the commentary : 1, 305 de
quo loco suo in quarto libro dictum est; 4, 462 quod plenius in
primo georgicorum dictum est ; 3, 420 sane alia Scylla fuit, de qua
in bucolicis (VI 74) plenius dictum est; 8, 677 de eo in tertio
georgicorum in ipso loco plenius dictum est. The difference
between the two commentaries is shown in a few passages. Ad
5, 737 S. says: latet enim, ut supra (I 277) diximus, verum
nomen urbis; D. adds : et nomen quidem Romae a poeta dictum
est ; nam verum urbis nomen, ut dictum est, latet. 9, 4 is some-
what similar, S. using *ut diximus*, while D. has *plenius illo dictum
est*, but with reference to another word. Cf. B. 6, 61 quod plenius
in Aeneidos tertio libro (113) memoravimus, *ubi etiam de ipsis
malis fabula relata est. Ostensum est* occurs in S. 1, 19 (*om. KC*),
monstratum est 1, 1. Eleven other instances are in D., *relatum*
occurring five times, and *narratum est* 4, 99; 5, 30 sicut narratum
est. The plural, *dicta sunt*, is used in D. (11, 69), and *narrata
sunt* 1, 744 and 6, 286, in both instances referring to succeeding
comments, as is also the case in 2, 310; 2, 456; 3, 466, where
other forms of *narrare* are used.

B. *Reader.*

1. *Second Person Singular, Present Indicative.*

The Servius has somewhat of a professorial tone in the frequent recurrence of the second person of the verb, the most frequently occurring of which is *subaudis* (75 : 3). This is also used in the imperative 1, 640; 4, 597; 6, 36; 1, 190, and B. 1, 53, though some MSS give the indicative in the first three passages. In D. *subaudis* is found 2, 79; 4, 293; 8, 35. The second person sing. is found in twenty-five other passages, seven of which are in D.: 1, 97; G. 1, 8 plenius habes; B. 6, 27 plene habes; G. 3, 174 dum quosdam domas; 4, 696; 5, 245. Both S. and D. have the sec. per. 10, 628 *agis . . .* loqueris. *Intellegis* occurs five times in S.: 1, 559; 1, 598; 3, 260; 6, 640; 6, 654. In about half of the remaining instances the indicative is used with *si* either with or without an accompanying subjunctive, e. g. 1, 743 si fabulam respicis . . . intellege; si autem veritatem requiris, varia est opinio philosophorum; B. 3, 16 ut si dicas . . . ponis, si autem velis . . . exprimes. 10, 62 si . . . vis referre, sic dic: . . . si vero . . . vis referre, sic intellege. The best illustration of the use in an independent statement is 1, 530 aut enim Hesperiam solam dicis et significas Italiam, aut addis 'ultimam' et significas Hispaniam. For an instance of the sec. per. explaining the words of Vergil, see 5, 711 EST TIBI *id est habes.*

2. *Future.*

Invenies is found seven times in D., five times (1, 651; 3, 211; 3, 274; 5, 105; 9, 213) with *plenius* where reference is made to a fuller discussion of the subject in other parts of the commentary. In 11, 243 *invenies* is used in the same way, while 3, 399 the reference is to a passage in Tacitus. *Referes* occurs 8, 88 vel ad Tiberim, vel ad stagnum referes. These passages have no parallels in S., where the future is used, as in B. 3, 16 (line 15 above), only in the conclusion of a conditional sentence, e. g. 8, 402 si solvas, invenies; 3, 671 si detraxeris, invenies. Cf. D. ad G. 4, 399 inanes eos facies, si adhibueris vim; 9, 51 quidquid enim addideris sensus admittet.

3. *Present Subjunctive.*

The second person of the present subjunctive is most commonly used in conditional or result clauses, though in D. there are a few

exceptions: 4, 696 nolo illum putes universa confundere; 9, 569 nescias de quo dixerit; 11, 258 ne putes forte factum; G. 2, 434 et transit iam ad illa, quae putes contemnenda. S. has per quod possis perire 7, 461, and nec mireris equas currere G. 1, 59.

One of the most common forms of statement in the subjunctive is the comparative conditional *ut si dicas*, which is found twenty-one times in S., and in D. 12, 162 ut si dicas 'tempora radiis cingitur.' In addition to *ut si dicas*, S. (6, 724) has ut si includas and ut si . . . polluas et eam statim auferas. There is no difference shown in the use of the present in conditional (42 : 15) and result clauses (17 : 4).

4. *Imperfect.*

Excepting 2, 393 mire 'adcommodat,' ut ignorares, quorum esset, the use of the imperfect is confined to S., which has *ut putares* eight times, e. g. 3, 665; 5, 1 sic altum, ut medium putares; 5, 110 sic pulchri, ut sacros p.; 5, 119 ita magna, ut urbem p.; 10, 569 SIC ut non unam manum p.; 11, 672 tanta celeritate . . . ut unum ictum p.   1, 518 bene addidit 'lecti' ne penitus omnes intellegeres. Cf. 3, 284 ne intellegeres . . . acciperes. 11, 56 both D. and S. have *optares* for *optabis* in Vergil.

5. *Perfect* (37 : 13).

Legeris and *dixeris* are the verbs most commonly used in the perfect subjunctive, and generally refer to textual readings or interpretations of the meaning. In D. are two perfects not referring to the text: B. 9, 8 cum ab una parte ad cacumen ascenderis, ab alia usque ad aquam descenderis; G. 1, 106 qua duxeris sequuntur.

6. *Imperative.*

In four passages an imperative of Vergil is explained by a present subjunctive: 6, 95 NE CEDE ne cedas; 7, 202 NE FUGITE ne fugiatis, ne ignoretis; 9, 113 NE TREPIDATE ne festinetis. Cf. 6, 544 NE SAEVI ne irascere: Et antique dictum est: nam nunc 'ne saevias' dicimus. The verbs most commonly used are *accipe* (12 : 3), *intellige* (11 : 3), *ut puta* (10 : 4), *distingue* (1 : 3), *subdistingue* (2 : 1), *iunge* (3 : 2) and *vide* (1 : 4). In addition to these there are half a dozen scattering examples in S. The number of occurrences is small, and only in the case of *vide* does there seem to be a preference shown by either commentary.

7. *Questions.*

Questions direct as well as indirect are common in both commentaries, though in some respects they differ widely, D. much the more frequently resorting to a question instead of making a direct statement.

1. *Num* (22).—Questions introduced by *num* are confined to D., which has twenty-two examples, e. g. 10, 458 AVSVM num pro 'audentem'? 10, 67 FATIS AUCTORIBUS num hic 'responsis'?

2. *An.*—The use of *an* in direct questions is also very noticeable. It is found in 100 passages in D. (127 times), it being frequently repeated, and 3, 278 occurring four times in succession: INSPERATA TELLVRE an quia saxosa loca; an quia per medios hostes navigaverant; an quia tempestate; an quia (cum) Graeca? However, the word is generally found in short questions, e. g. 11, 568 an ob feritatem? 12, 520 ipse pater, an pater eius? 12, 725 an inquirit, utrum tempus sit?

In D. there are fourteen passages in which *an* is used in àn indirect question, e. g. 3, 80 consultum venerat, an Salaminam peteret comes Priamo. Only two such questions were noticed in S., 4, 56 explorant an dii vellent; 6, 404 quaeratur an animae de Elysio in corpora possint redire?

3. *Utrum . . . an* (27 : 80).—Though *utrum . . . an* is used in both commentaries, in S. the questions are indirect; in D. direct in all but nine passages. In S. the interrogative is in a few instances omitted, the comment merely continuing and being dependent on the statement of Vergil: 1, 517 QVAE FORTVNA utrum prospera, an adversa? 10, 890 MVLTA MOVENS utrum in ipsum, an in equum tela torqueret? G. 1, 25 INCERTVM EST, VRBESNE CAESAR utrum velis terrarum, an maris, an caeli imperium possidere? In D. nearly all are double direct questions, e. g. 3, 236 AC IVSSI hic 'iussi' utrum verbum an participium sit, id est utrum illi iussi sint, an ego iussi? 4, 143 ergo 'hibernam' utrum quod ibi hiemare soleat; an frigidam; an hieme temperatam; an quam hiberno tempore deserere soleat? 5, 426 utrum in pedum, an in manuum digitos? 8, 6 utrum ordine, an dignitate? 8, 675 utrum clipeo, an mari?

4. *Utrum* (6 : 2) is used alone a few times in both commentaries, and in D. twice in a direct question: 1, 239 utrum fatis bonis in praesentibus? 4, 449 et utrum 'inanes' quae Didoni nihil prosint?

5. *Num ... an* is found in D. 10, 131 quid est moliri? num inicere, an temptare? and 10, 161 et 'quaerit sidera' num de sideribus quaerit, an ipsa sidera, id est percenset. aut num causa quaerendi quod cupiat lucem?

6. *Utrumne.*—Ad 1, 218 D. says '*seu' pro utrumne,* and G. 1, 26 has *utrumne ... velis* in a comment on a passage of Vergil containing *-ne ... an.*

7. *Anne* was noticed in D. 8, 345 interrogavit, anne hic, suum locum ostendens, invenissent. In S. 1, 752 for *quales* in Vergil.

8. *Quis.*—Questions introduced by *quis* are not uncommon in D., but are avoided by S. They sound like school-room questions and in some cases are as much for the benefit of the questioner as of the hearer. These questions may be divided for convenience into several classes: Purely inquisitive (D. 10), *Quis ante hunc?,* without any indication whatever as to the answer, e. g. 12, 7 sane 'latronem' venatorem quis ante hunc? To the reader they indicate nothing more than 'Look it up,' and seem very much like marginal notes, as though some teacher or reader of Vergil had jotted them down as topics for future investigation. Repeated questions coming from pupils or other commentators, differing from the last only in this, that they depend on *quaeritur*: 4, 120; 8, 195; 12, 351; 12, 517; 12, 619 quaeritur quis 'inlaetabile' dixerit? In the other cases some word indicating time is used, as in 12, 351 q. quis prius nigrantem dixerit? Presumptive (2 : 8), in which *quis ignorat, nescit* or some similar term is used, as though the statement made was familiar to all. Of these S. has but three: 9, 134 quis potest scire; B. 8, 47 quis enim ignorat Medeam ... interemisse? G. 4, 66. There are also a few general questions such as *quis indignetur 10, 468; quis ferret 11, 417; quis ... deponat 2, 668.* Cf. 1, 8; 1, 78; *1, 92; 4, 176;* 12, 761.

8. *Periphrastic Statements.*

The passive periphrastic form of the verb may be taken as the equivalent of an imperative. It is frequently used to indicate some necessary step in the interpretation of Vergil. In the use of some verbs the difference between S. and D. is clearly marked. *Sciendum* (194 : 13) is the form most commonly occurring. It is frequently preceded by *sane,* and in many instances is followed by *quia* or *quod* as is *notandum* (72 : 15). In this number is included 11, 879 †potanda elocutio, quia consequatur 'hos,' sed intellegendum 'eos qui.' (Potanda *F,* portanda *Daniel, quod quid*

sibi velit non intelligo. fortasse rotunda.)   The frequent use of *notandum* in similar statements indicates that it should be the reading here.   The most noticeable difference is in the use of *subaudiendum* (1 : 27).   In addition to this, *audiendum* is used by D. 8, 397, and 9, 613 *bis audiendum*.   *Pronuntiandum* is used (4 : 14), though with the latter might be placed *enuntiandum* 1, 507; and *adiuvandum pronuntiatione* 11, 258; 11, 303; G. 1, 146.   A few others indicate a preference on the part of D.: *accipiendum* (12 : 22), *intellegendum* (17 : 22), *fero* and comps. (5 : 9), *iungendum* (5 : 7), and *suspendendum* (3 : 4).   *Distinguendum* (34 : 8, including *subdistinguendum* 4, 323), *legendum* (16 : 8), and scattering examples (27 : 13) vary somewhat from the general average ratio.

C. *Vergil.*

The quotations from Vergil occur frequently in both commentaries, and there seems to be no difference so far as the use of the word *Vergilius* is concerned (266 : 85).   There is a decided difference in the use of *poeta* instead of *Vergilius*, of *ac si diceret* referring to the words of Vergil, and of *per transitum* in calling attention to the transitions made by the poet.

1. *Poeta* (66 : 97).—The word *poeta* referring to Vergil is used relatively much more frequently in D. than in S.   In both are found a few occurrences of *poeta* where it is used generically, and such instances are not counted.   But aside from the difference in the relative frequency there are other indications of a difference between the two commentaries.   S. does not attempt to characterize the poet, while D. is comparatively free in its laudations: 3, 349; 3, 463 occurs *divinus poeta*; 4, 262 peritus poeta; 1, 632 poeta, amator antiquitatis; 11, 532 peritissimus antiquitatis poeta; B. 8, 68 Vergilius peritus antiquitatis. Cf. 1, 305; 10, 419; G. 1, 269.

2. *Ac si diceret* (120 : 5).—In S., passages are fairly common in which an explanation of the words of Vergil is introduced by the words *ac si diceret*, e. g. G. 4, 229 THESAVRIS repositionibus, ac si diceret, 'apothecis'; 7, 204 VETERIS antiqui, ac si diceret, aurei saeculi imagine vivimus.   3, 156 TVAQVE ARMAQVE SECVTI ac si diceret, 'tuas partes.'   D. has proinde ac si diceret, G. 3, 56, in a comment introduced by *et aliter*, as is also G. 2, 350; G. 1, 29 ac si graece diceret.   In the comments on the Aeneid it is found 4, 218 (*edidit Stephanus*) and 4, 207 (*om. Daniel.*). Somewhat similar expressions are found in S. 3, 104 ac si dici possit, and B. 1, 32 ut ... dixerit peculium, ac si servus esset.

The typical form of expression in D. is shown by B. 7, 64 perinde enim est, ac si dixisset, the pluperfect *dixisset* with *quam si*, following a comparative, occurring eighteen times, e. g. 10, 370 melius 'ducis' quam si dixisset 'regis.' The imperfect *diceret* is used five times, e. g. 2, 161 magnificentius, quam si diceret 'Troiani.' S. has the imperfect eighteen times, e. g. B. 2, 70 SEMIPVTATA . . . plus est quam si inputata diceret. S. ad 5, 376 has OSTENDIT melius dixisset 'ostentat,' and D. 12, 906 ut si dixisset. Both have ut si diceret 3, 36; [2, 403], and *ut si dicatur* is found *9, 138*. In conditional sentences D. has *dixisset* four times, and *diceret* once, while S. has the latter twenty times. As will be seen, the form in S. is the imperfect subjunctive (160), while in D. there is a preference for the pluperfect (23 : 13). This indicates that the work of Vergil is viewed by S. as if it were a present work, while in D. it is considered as distinctly of the past.

3. *Per transitum* (48 : 2).—*Transitum* occurs most commonly in connection with *per*, though in four passages (1, 226; 2, 65; 10, 672; B. 6, 41) it is used with *facere*, and 9, 1 with *culpare*. The passages in D. containing *per transitum* (3, 287 poeta p. t. tetigit; B. 6, 43 p. t. tetigit) are similar to the ones in S., which uses the phrase most frequently with *tangere* and *ostendere*.

D. *Sources.*

1. *Definite.—a. Verbs of Saying, etc.; Active.*

Of the verbs used in the third singular present giving the words or opinions of Vergil, of other authors, or of characters in the Aeneid, *ait* and *dicit* are by far the most common. It is impossible to draw any exact line of demarcation between the two on the basis of the character of the statement dependent on them. *Dicit* is sometimes followed by statements of Vergil, as 6, 687 dicit 'sic equidem ducebam animo'; and *ait* is sometimes used where only an indefinite statement is made, as 1, 30 *in quinto ait Neptuni beneficio liberatus.* However, the distinction holds in a general way that *ait* is used with exact quotations, and *dicit* with general statements which may also include the exact words of authors. It is impossible to compare the words with reference to the use of the word *Vergilius* as subject, since the characters in the poems are represented as quoting the words assigned to them by Vergil. No effort has been made to verify the completeness of the results of a single examination of the occurrences of these

words, but from the number of instances collected (*ait* 576 : 333; *dicit* 905 : 254), it seems that S. uses *dicit* more freely than *ait*, and D. *ait* relatively more frequently than *dicit*.

When *ut* is used with *dicit* the subject is generally placed second, as 1, 52 ut Varro dicit, and the number is much greater in S. than in D. (58 : 3). *Ait* with *ut* or *sicut* is used about the same number of times in the two commentaries (25 : 23), but the subject is more frequently second in D. than in S. (5 : 12). *Docet* is used about the same by both (36 : 14), *refert* is found in twenty-four passages in D.; *tradit poeta* is used by S. 1, 387, but the verb occurs in fourteen passages in D. Other verbs have not been carefully noticed, though there seems to be a preference shown by D. for *appellare* of the verbs used in naming.

aa. Passive Forms.

A large number of verbs is used in the present passive in some of which the preference of the writer is clearly seen: *Traditur*, like the active forms, is characteristic of D. (17), as is *videtur* with *aliis*, *quibusdam*, etc. (D. 19), S. having *placet* 9, 703; 11, 93; G. 2, 389. *Accipitur* (1 : 7), *intellegitur* (18 : 16) are relatively most frequent in D., as are a few infinitives with *posse*, *debet*, or *oportet*: *accipi* (9 : 37), *subaudiri* (7 : 10), *referri* (22 : 12). A few others are preferred by S., *invenitur* (48 : 10). *Legitur* (54 : 22), frequently with *et* in the discussion of textual readings, is used by both in giving quotations from Vergil as well as from other authors.

b. Prepositions 'according to.'

1. *Secundum* (421 : 65).—Both this preposition and *iuxta* are used with the names of authors as well as with a considerable number of other words indicating the source or the ground for an assertion made by the commentator. For convenience the instances will be divided into several classes.

a. Author named (153 : 12).—*Secundum* in S. is used with the names of quite a large number of authors, Greek and Latin, early and late. In D. four Romans are mentioned by name: Sallust 8, 479; Trebatius 11, 316; Varro and Cassius 12, 603. Two Greeks are mentioned 3, 212, furiarum mater secundum Hesiodum Terra, secundum Aeschylum Nox est.

β. References to persons not named (106 : 19).—In this division there is no apparent difference between the two commen-

SERVIUS AND THE SCHOLIA OF DANIEL. 285

taries, at least so far as the words dependent on *secundum* are concerned, it being used with the names of sects—*sectas, Epicurios, Stoicos*—with general titles—*mathematicos, physicos, philosophos, theologos*—with pronouns—*alios, aliquos, quosdam, eos* limited by *qui dicunt*—names of nations—*Aegyptios, Etruscos, Graecos, Persas, Romanos*—with terms designating the ancients—*antiquos, veteres*—and a few other words of similar import.

γ. Abstract nouns (137 : 29).—Here the usage is about the same as in the last division, the preposition being used with such nouns as *morem, ritum, ius, naturam, opinionem, rationem, etymologiam, euphoniam, usum, sensum,* etc. The words of S. are repeated by D. in two passages, 1, 8; 4, 469. Ad 6, 34 the Greek given by S. is translated by D.: κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον intellegimus *id est secundum taciturnitatem* (om. G.), though the Greek occurs elsewhere without notice in both commentaries. Cf. 4, 227; 7, 195; 9, 83; 11, 152.

δ. Statement of an Author (16 : 4).—*Secundum quod* is found in S. fourteen times, e. g. 11, 262 secundum quod, ut supra diximus, Menelaus ad Aegyptum Iovis voluntate pervenit. *Sec. illud* occurs 7, 7; B. 7, 23 SI NON POSSVMVS OMNES secundum illud dixit (VIII 63) non omnia possumus omnes. D. has *sec. illud* 9, 266; 11, 224; *sec. ea* G. 1, 263; and *sec. haec* G. 4, 399.

ε. Work of an Author (9 : 1).—Three passages in S. (1, 287; G. 3, 25; 2, 533) have *sec. historiam.* In five places the name of a work is given with *sec.*: B. 5, 66 Porphyrii librum, quem solem appellavit; 3, 571 Aetnam Vergilii; 5, 370 Troica Neronis; 3, 284 Cic. Hortensium; 8, 314 Hesiodi Theogoniam. Ad 4, 469 both S. and D. have *sec. tragoediam Pacuvii.*

2. *Iuxta* (5 : 51).—For convenience of comparison the divisions here will correspond to those made in the case of *secundum.*

α. With the names of authors *iuxta* occurs in the Scholia four times, and twice in S.: 1, 96 i. Homerum; G. 2, 159 i. Catonem.

β. (D. 14.)—In this division *iuxta* is found with *antiquos* or *veteres* in all but two places: 8, 364 i. sectam Cynicam; B. 8, 75 i. Pythagoreos.

γ. (3 : 30.)—*Iuxta* and *secundum* are used in the same comment in D.: 2, 426 'Iustum' sec. leges . . . 'aequum' iuxta naturam accipiunt; and in 3, 18 hic sec. accusativum . . . aliter iuxta nominativum. In S. the two words are used together: 10, 230 hoc loco sec. quartam declinationem, in bucolicis (VIII 22) iuxta secundam. Here the use of *iuxta* was due to *secundam,*

as also with *secundam formam* B. 2, 54.   S. also has *iuxta* with *regulam* 7, 683.   In D. it is used most frequently with *morem* and *usum*.

δ.—*Iuxta illud* is found twice in D., 4, 62; 6, 278.   *Iuxta illud dictum*, followed by a quotation, occurs 4, 56.

bb. Prepositions 'in.'

The encroachment in late Latin of *in* on *apud* with the names of authors is well known.   The extension of the use of *in* was probably due to the use of that preposition in references to the works bearing the names of persons.   Familiarity with passages such as *Cicero in maiore Catone* (G. 3, 96) and *Cicero in Hortensio* (8, 479; *485*), and especially those in which the name of the author was omitted, such as *in heauton timorumeno* (1, 548), must have gradually accustomed the Romans to the use of *in* for *apud*.

1. *In* (92 : 3).—*In* with the names of authors is practically confined to S., it being found in D., 4, 698 in Catone (in *T* a marginal reading); 7, 464 in toto Vergilio ("*e Turonensi Daniel edidit*") (cf. 1, 576 in omni Vergilio); 10, 164 in idoneis auctoribus ("*ex uno Turonensi Daniel edidit*").   S. uses *in* with the names of authors the same as with the names of works: 1, 4 constat multa in auctoribus inveniri . . . invenitur etiam in aliis partibus orationis; 10, 105 et in Sallustio et in Philippicis; 12, 359 in historiis legimus, item in Lucano; B. prooem., p. 2, 2 in poeta . . . in Aeneide.   It is also used with *apud* for the sake of variety: 6, 154 DEMVM et haec particula tam apud Vergilium, quam apud omnes idoneos auctores hoc significat, licet in aliis diversa significat.

2. *Apud* (32 : 28).—The relative number of occurrences of *apud* is greater in D. than in S., but about the same for both *in* and *apud* if the two words be considered together.   This is also true for *secundum* and *iuxta*.   With the latter, D. uses both; S. practically only one, *secundum*.   With *in* and *apud* this is reversed, S. using both, while D. prefers *apud*.   The difference in the use of *in* and *apud* may be taken as an indication that the scholiast followed rules of composition based on classic models, while S., with more independence, used the freer form of expression of his own times.   The examples of the use of *apud* are alike in both commentaries, and of themselves indicate nothing in regard to authorship.   But taken in connection with those containing *in*,

there is seen to be a clear indication of voluntary selection in the case of the two words.

Besides the instances where *apud* occurs with the names of authors, or with pronouns referring to authors, there are a number of instances in which it is used with *Graecos* or with *Latinos*, or with both, as 1, 257 omnia quae apud Graecos *ei* diphthongon habent apud Latinos in *e* productum convertuntur. Most of these are general references to the Greeks and Latins, but in some instances, as 1, 394 *apud Graecos legitur, auctores* is to be supplied.

2. *Indefinite References.*

References and quotations assigned to no particular author are very common in both commentaries. A very convenient way of giving the general conclusions of others without giving their exact words, their greater frequency in D. is a very fair indication of its greater indefiniteness as compared with S. We have noticed 1484 passages in which *alii, quidam,* or some other indefinite subject is used to set forth the opinions of others. In over two hundred of these passages the subject is repeated one or more times, though but one verb is used, e. g. 1, 533 *alii ... alii ... alii ... alii ... alii ... alii.* In a much less number two verbs are used with the same subject, e. g. 2, 394 multi hic distinguunt et ad Aeneam referunt. Such passages have been classed with the first verb used, as the number is not large enough to materially affect the general proportion of the different words used. As there are some preferences shown both in the case of subject and of verb, these will be considered separately.

a. *Subject* (468 : 1016).

1. *Alii* (257 : 404).—*Alii* is found more frequently than any other indefinite subject, and is more freely used in D. than in S. This is due to the fact that the statements in D. are supplementary to those of S. or make statements at variance with those contained in it.

2. *Quidam* (75 : 460).—Statements containing *quidam* are about the same as those containing *alii,* though in a few instances D. seems to bring under it a statement which has already been made by S. Cf. 1, 317; 2, 7.

3. *Nonnulli* (16 : 81).—With *nonnulli* the differences are less marked, though D. uses the term much the more freely. Among

the examples in S. has been counted 10, 832 statuae nonnullae antiquorum docent.

4. *Multi* (103 : 55), 5. *Plerique* (15 : 4).—With these words is given a general summary of views, and the relative number is about the same in S. and D., though it might be expected that they would occur more frequently in D.

6. *Aliqui, aliquot, aliquanti* (1 : 8).—S. 2, 195 has *aliqui male dicant*, while D. has *aliqui accipiunt* 1, 109; 1, 519; G. 1, 55; 240; *aliquanti* 3, 628; 11, 633; G. 1, 29; *aliquot* 1, 121.

7. With *sunt qui* only a few instances are found, most of them being in D. 2, 121; 3, 332; 8, 343; B. 6, 41; in S. 11, 262.

One feature worthy of note is the use of *male, stulte* or some such word giving a little hint of the attitude of the commentator to his brethren of the same craft. This is especially characteristic of S., which has *male* twenty-nine times with *quidam*, e. g. G. 3, 46 nam male quidam 'ardentis Caesaris' accipiunt. A little variety is sometimes given by the use of *stulte*, e. g. 4, 1 licet stulte quidam dicant. *Vile* is used 8, 439; *pessime* 12, 715.

aa. *Verbs* (468 : 1016).

While the differences between the commentaries are noticeable in the case of the subjects, it is still more so when the verbs only are considered. As the ratio of the occurrences in the mass is about 1 : 2, we should expect about the same ratio in the case of the individual verbs. Some of them do not differ very materially from this. (1) *Dicunt* (124 : 198) and (2) *volunt* (129 : 213) are of the most frequent occurrence, and go far toward establishing the ratio for the entire mass. (3) *Intelligunt* (7 : 32), in S. only with *alii*, (4) *putant* (8 : 58) and (5) *accipiunt* (25 : 211) differ widely from the general ratio, the latter verb especially seeming to be a favorite with D., though the favoritism is much more clearly shown in the case of (6) *tradunt* (1 : 157), S. using it 3, 63 quidam *manes* deos infernos tradunt, followed in D. by quidam ... dicunt: plurimi ... tradiderunt; alii ... (7) *Legunt* (80 : 33) reverses the ratio for the mass and shows the closer attention paid by S. to questions of textual reading. (8) The miscellaneous verbs occurring but a small number of times each are about equally divided (94 : 114). In the case of a few, however, individual preferences are shown: *exponunt* (1 : 10), *reprehendunt* (1 : 9) and *quaerunt* (10 : 3) being the most noticeable.

In a comparatively few instances in both commentaries *dicunt* and *vocant* are used without specified subject, e. g. (in S.) 1, 649 quod vulgo herbacanthum dicunt; B. 5, 17 herbae genus, quam Orcitunicam vulgo vocant; (in D.) G. 2, 478 quod vulgo dicunt 'laborat luna'; B. 8, 55 quas vulgo ulucos vocant. *Aiunt, ferunt* and *perhibent* (a Vergilian reminiscence) occur a few times in D., though in most of these the subject may refer to a preceding noun or pronoun at some distance from the verb.

b. Substituted Expressions.

1. *Alii sic.*—One feature in D. worthy of notice is the use of *sic* with *alii* or *quidam* without any verb expressed. Both *ita* and *sic* are freely used with verbs, e. g. 1, 12 *veteres colonias ita definiunt*; 9, 230 alii sic intelligunt; but the omission of the verb is peculiar to D. and is found but rarely outside of the comments on G., where it is used seven times. *Alii ita* is used in one doubtful passage, 2, 159, and *alii* twice, 11, 56, where *T* reads *quidam sic . . . alii ita*, the latter occurring again 8, 216. *Alii sic accipiunt* is followed by *alii sic*, 11, 443. *Quidam sic* occurs G. 4, 483, preceded by *et aliter*, which also precedes *alii sic* G. 3, 5; 3, 35; 4, 39; and follows 4, 386.

2. *Et aliter* (D. 224).—At no point do the Scholia differ more from S. than in the use of *et aliter* in the comments on G. It is used to introduce a divergent or an additive statement without any reference to the source from which it came, e. g. G. 2, 271 AXI septentrioni; nam ἅμαξα dicitur. *et aliter: id est septentrionali.* Though generally equivalent to *alii dicunt*, to the scholiast it seems to have been merely a formula, for G. 2, 70 we find *et aliter : alii legunt*, one of which is superfluous. The use of *et aliter* in this portion of the Scholia shows that it must have been written by some one not the author of any other part, for it is altogether improbable that a writer using the term so freely could have written other parts where there was abundant opportunity for its use without introducing it into the comments. It is an indication of personal preference so marked that by itself it is sufficiently strong to establish the fact that the writer of these parts was not the author of any other parts of the commentary.

3. *Aliter* (47 : 29).—*Aliter* is used by D. the same as *et aliter* is used in the comments on G., and is equivalent to *alii* with a verb or *alibi aliter dicitur*, e. g. 3, 73 item aliter; 8, 189 aliter in

20

quarto. In S. the word is regularly used with a verb—most generally *procedit*—showing the necessity for a preceding statement, e. g. 1, 250 sic loquitur quasi una sit de Troianis; nam aliter sensus non procedit; 6, 517 euantis Phrygias: aliter non stat versus. (*Aliter . . . aliter* occurs a comparatively few number of times—4 : 10—in contrasted statements.)

c. Fabula.

Fabula talis est (15 including *haec* 3, 104; 6, 659: 28 including *ista* 3, 489; *sic* G. 3, 391). With verbs S. has *ut fabula fert* 5, 801; D. *loqui* 1, 618; 619; 744; B. 10, 18. *Narratur* is used 2, 44; 3, 466 narratur et alia fabula. In S. the prevailing form of statement is with *habet*; as, ut habet fabula 3, 14, but more generally with *hoc* as object (7), e. g. 8, 568 fabula quidem hoc habet. This use of *hoc* is not confined to *fabula*, for we have noticed a score of passages in S. where it is used with other words; as, *historia, veritas, opinio* and *ratio.* Similar examples are of rare occurrence in D.: 1, 619 ut veritas habet; 2, 250 sphaerae ratio habet; G. 1, 100 expositio hoc habet.

d. Archaisms.

An outline of the use of *antiqui, maiores, veteres* in D. and S. has been given in a previous article (A. J. P. XV 166 seqq.), so far as they are used with verbs of speaking. The following presentation will consider all the occurrences of the words, not only as nouns but also as adjectives.

1. *Archaismos.*—There are no special features in the use of this word, the MSS of both the commentaries having a tendency to confuse it with the word *sarcasmos.*

2. *Vetus* (17 : 194).—When *veteres* is used as subject (11 : 97), *dicebant* is the verb of most frequent occurrence in D., though found but four times in S. The genitive plural *veterum* occurs seven times in D.; *a veteribus tractum* 10, 270; *veteribus mos fuit* G. 3, 305. As an adjective, *vetus* is used thirty times in D., but in S. only 8, 361 curiis veteribus. *Apud veteres* (5 : 27) is more evenly divided between S. and D. than either *secundum veteres* (D. 8) or *iuxta veteres* (D. 8). *Vetusta voce* occurs 2, 77; *vetustissimorum sacrorum* 10, 419; *vetustas* 5, 448, and *vetuste* eleven times.

3. *Antiquus* (144 : 71).—In the use of the different forms of *antiquus* the two commentaries approach more nearly the general

average ratio for the two works, though there are a few special features in the usage of each. As subject, *antiqui* occurs about the same number of times in each (27 : 24). As an adjective (100 : 38) the number in D. is considerably smaller, a few examples in each being comparatives or superlatives. In the plural, the genitive (3 : 3) is not common. S. has the accusative three times with *apud*, while D. has eleven instances with *apud*, *iuxta* or *secundum*. *Antiquitas* (6 : 2) is occasionally met with, and *antiquatum* occurs 4, 431. *Antique* is much more freely used by D. than by S. (7 : 16). The number of occurrences is, however, less noticeable than the fact that the word in D. is used independently of any other word, while in S. it occurs only in connection with some other word indicating time, as in 4, 403 POPVLANT antique dixit: nam hoc verbum apud veteres activum fuit, nunc tantum deponens est.

4. *Maiores* (93 : 5).—The use of *maiores* is characteristic of S., but is avoided by D. As subject it occurs twenty-eight times in S., twice in D.: 6, 1 calas enim dicebant maiores nostri fustes (see crit. app. ad loc.), and 3, 148 eaque nostros publice curasse maiores, in a quotation from Varro. *Apud maiores* is found (58 : 2—6, 1 ; 1, 632), and other cases (7 : 1), the latter being due to *veterum* preceding : 8, 105 et libri veterum tradunt a maioribus sacrificando parsimoniam observatam esse. S. has *nostri* 1, 179 ; 1, 737 ; 7, 176 ; 7, 787 ; 6, 660 ; B. 5, 73. In addition to the two instances given above, D. has *maiores nostri* 1, 632, apud maiores nostros mos fuit, and adds it to the statement of S. 3, 257 maiores enim *nostri* has *mensas* habebant (nostri *et* mensas *hab.* C), and 8, 269.

Both *maiores* and *veteres* are used 8, 423 plerumque m. ponere consuetos v. dicere solebant. 7, 601 *antiquos* in contrast to *vicinos* is used to modify *maiores* : volens ostendere antiquos eius consulares fuisse, vicinos vero ignavissimos. (*Nostri 'hostes' pro hospitibus dixerunt* occurs 4, 424, in a comment contrasting Roman and Grecian derivation of the word for enemy.)

ILL. WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, ILL.   R. B. STEELE.

IV.—THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE LETTERS OF CICERO TO ATTICUS IN THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

In spite of the light which has been thrown during recent years upon the tradition of the Letters to Atticus, there is still much that is obscure in the relations existing between the different classes of manuscripts. Lehmann in his famous monograph, 'De Ciceronis ad Atticum epistulis recensendis et emendandis,' remarks that Professor Purser, of Dublin, had examined the manuscripts of these letters which were found in the British Museum, and that this examination showed that Harleianus 2466 belongs in the Δ class; that Additi Codices 6793 and 11926 agree in many places with Σ and disagree with Δ, and may perhaps have sprung from a confusion of the two traditions; that Harleianus 2491 seems to be very like these last two; and, finally, that Burneius 146 deserves further study, as in some important places it preserves the readings of Σ. In Hermathena (No. 19, 1893) Professor Purser gives the results of his examination of these manuscripts, speaking of them as "the comparatively unimportant results of a hasty inspection," but at the end of his paper he expresses the hope that he may be able at some future time to continue his study more carefully, and to compare certain readings with those of the earlier editions. Up to the present time nothing further has appeared, and the following notes are written in the hope that they may be of some use in the general effort to determine the tradition of the text. It seemed possible to arrive at some conclusions somewhat more definite than Purser's.

Of the five MSS now in the Museum, which are mentioned above, Codex Additus 6793 is, as Purser says, the most interesting of all, and will be taken up first.

This is a paper MS of the 15th century, octavo in size and containing 303 folia. Each leaf measures 21×14 centimetres, and has 25 lines on each page. It contains (1) on a few pages at the beginning, numbered 1–6v, which had been left blank, some of the epistulae ad Brutum "scribbled, not written, in a strange, straggling hand"; (2) ff. 7v–296v, epist. ad Atticum libri XVI;

(3) ff. 296v–297r, epistula Petrarchae ad Ciceronem; (4) ff. 298v–303v, more of the epist. ad Brutum. The scribblings on the first and last leaves are of no account whatever, but it is a matter of importance, as Purser has pointed out, that only the Letters to Atticus are found in this MS, a fact which of itself suggests a variation from the Medicean tradition.

This MS ends as M does, with lib. XVI 16b. 1 (*magnam*). There are the following cases of confusion in the order of the text: At the middle of f. 14r, I 13. 2 breaks off with the word *facetiis*, and V 10. 3 begins with (*in*)*timis sensibus*, continuing to V 18. 1, *omni exercitu*, near the bottom of f. 18v. There the text begins again at I 16. 9, *ne aut ignorando*, and continues to IV 6. 2, *Philoxeno*, at the bottom of f. 67v. From this point we read V 3. 2, *quae mihi*, to V 20. 3, *rumore adventus*, at the bottom of f. 77v. Here begins IV 19. 2, *heus tu*, which continues to V 3. 2, *acceperam praeter*, at the top of f. 80r, where we find the text from IV 6. 2, *ignosco qui*, to IV 19. 2, *istorum sed*, at the bottom of f. 89v. At the top of f. 90r, V 20. 3, *nostri et Cassio*, begins again, and from here on there are no more breaks except one or two in the 9th book, which are of no moment.

Four, or possibly five, hands can be distinguished in this MS, as follows: *Ma*, ff. 7r–53v, epp. I 1 to III 15. 1, *esse confi-*, a good book hand; *Mb*, ff. 53v–54r, epp. III 15. 1, *-matum*, to III 15. 4, *quae par-*, not so good as *Ma*; *Mc*, ff. 54r–130v, epp. III 15. 4, *anteluxerunt*, to IX 1, very poor and more cursive in character; *Md*, ff. 131r–226v, epp. IX 1. 1 to XII 31. 3, *agen-*, a good hand. From this point we have *Mc* again, or a hand extremely like it, but with ink that is not so apt to run thickly, and a stiffer pen. Books V and VI are counted as one, and therefore bk. VII is numbered VI, and so on to the end.

In all the hands the Greek words are omitted and space left for their insertion later, except in a comparatively small number of cases where wholly unintelligible signs apparently represent the Greek. The different hands are distinguished by the presence or absence of the salutation, and by the style and colors of the capitals and illuminations. Corrections are in a hand much later than those of the scribes, except in a small number of cases, and in general corrections occurring after f. 23 are later than those which precede.

As has already been remarked, *Ma* extends over the first 53 ff., and there is a break in the text at I 13. 2, where the passage

V 10. 3–18. 1 is inserted.   The first book is then taken up again, but not exactly at the point of breaking off.   The continuation is at I 16. 9, the intervening portion being entirely omitted, and the text is in regular order through the rest of the hand.   Inasmuch as the passage from the 5th book is read in both hands, *Ma* here and *Mc* in its proper place, a comparison is easily made.

With respect to *Mc*, it may be said at once that it is but a copy of M, and of no further value.   With *Ma* the case is wholly different.   In more than 120 cases in this short passage, *Ma* disagrees with M and its copy *Mc*.   The following is a list of the principal variations:

Med., Add. 6793 *Mc.*	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
10. 3 adrogantur	arroguntur
5 amores	mores
quadam	quaedam
11. 1 romam	rome
posthac	hoc
2 Marcellus	Marcelli
nostro	nostri
4 gneius	gnesius
tullius	tu illius
rodiorum	radiorum
5 admiratione	abiuratione
inveniar	inveniat
6 ad quae mihi	ad ea quae mihi
deferto	defero
6 nam mihi	omnia mi
tollerent	tollerant
ipsi	ipsum
posse	posset
Manius	Memmius
7 est	erat
datas	claras
12. 1 qui nos	quos
citius	dediti
cursum confecimus	conficimus cursum
aphracta	afracto
2 consilium nostrum	nostrum consilium
cum haec leges	cura haec leges
3 rogo	roga

Med., Add. 6793 *Mc.*	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
tuis	suis
13. 1 ambo villam	Bovillam
	\<in modum\> Σ^1
pretoris ea	praetori
cenanti	cernanti
2 cure	cara
thermoque	temeroque
appolinicense	Appollinem cense
praeterea rationem	praeter eam rationem
3 queo simus annui	que osimus annium
maxime queso	maximeque si Σ
cuius	cum
14. 1 conficiebamus	conficiamus
commovero	commoveto
tamen interea	interea tamen
dein confectae pactiones	deinde confecto partiones
2 nemini minimo qui-⎱ dem fuit sumptui ⎰	nemini fuit ne minimo quidem sensui
mihi gratius facere potes	facere gratius potes nihil
imprimis quid	imprimisque
15. 1 quippe et iis	quippetus
habeat	habet
3 ignota sunt mihi	mihi rogata sunt
poteris	portis
16. 1 haec	ea
3 levantur tamen miserae	levantur tamen munere civitates
nullus [civitates	ullus
de lege	est lege
nec tectum	me lectum
concursus fiunt	acursus fuit
4 agit	agitur
concisos	conscios
17. 2 insumatur	infirmatur
nam omnes	non omnis
ad te	et te
4 esset	etiam
5 scripsit	scribit

---

[1] The letter Σ after a reading shows that it is also quoted from the MS of that class.

Med., Add. 6793 *Mc.*	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
annui essemus	annuissemus
receperat	acciperat
quam	quod
6 ibi	in
insector	sector
18. 1 esse in syria	isse in syriam

There are some twenty cases where from one to twenty-one words are omitted in *Ma*, which marks great carelessness on the part of the copyist rather than divergences from the received text. It is also to be noted that in the list of examples just given there are only five places (10. 5 *quaedam*, 11. 6 *Memmius*, 13. 1 *in modum* (om. in Med.), 13. 3 *maximeque si*, 14. 2 *imprimisque*) where *Ma* has the correct reading. Two of these are also the readings of the Σ class, viz. *in modum* and *maximeque si*. The reading *Bovillam*, 13. 1, is nearly correct and much better than that of M.

The list just given seems to prove that this MS in *Ma* preserves a tradition which is not simply that of M. So many variants, of such a nature as that found in most of those quoted, could not have resulted from mere copyists' errors. To what class, then, does this MS belong?

Our knowledge of the character of the Σ class is practically confined to the readings published by Lehmann in the monograph already mentioned. According to Gurlitt's published statement, Lehmann left strict injunctions that all of his literary remains should be destroyed. If this is done, students of Cicero's Letters to Atticus must wait until some one else has had time to make and publish another collation of the MSS of this class, for any further information about them. Until then, all inferences must be based on the readings which Lehmann had already printed. The very few cases quoted by Lehmann from Σ in this short portion of text are found in *Ma* of Add. 6793, with a slight exception. This certainly raises a presumption at once, that we have to do with another MS of that class.

Returning now to that part of the text from I 1 to III 15. 4— the part, that is, which belongs to *Ma*—and comparing with it the readings quoted by Lehmann as common and peculiar to the Σ class, we find that *Ma* agrees with them in 36 cases and differs only in the following three: I 2. 3 *nostrae academiae* (Σ), *acade-*

miae nostrae (M, *Ma*); I 20. 2 *civium* (Σ), *cum* (M, *Ma*); II 1. 17 *sint* (Σ), *sunt* (M, *Ma*). Further, in the 22 cases quoted by Lehmann, where E, one of the Σ class, preserves the correct reading against M, our MS agrees with E in all but four or possibly five cases, and these disagreements are of the most unimportant kind. These facts warrant the conclusion that *Ma* is due to a non-Medicean tradition, presumably that of the Σ MSS, and if this is so, it seems desirable to print a list of the principal variations from M, for purposes of further comparison.

In this collation certain minor variants are left out of account. This is the case in general where it seems reasonably sure that the variant is due solely to an error on the part of the copyist of this particular MS. The carelessness of this copyist is most striking, as may be seen in the numerous cases of misspelling and omission.

	Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
Liber I.		
1. 1	potentia qui illum non	iam qui illum non arbitrantur
	curavit [arbitramur	iurant (*corr. in mg.* iuravit)
	dum scribam	ut scribam
2	praeter mei ne minime M¹ ⎫	praeter me nemini
	praeter mihi nemini M² ⎭	
	adhuc informata	inforata addhuc
	revertamur	revertemus
3		pervelim <agere>
4	fuisse	esse
	accipere hoc mihi	mi hoc accipere
	amici	<ne contra> unius (*hoc ver-*
	is omnia	summa [*bum in ras.*)
5	eiut anaθma	diu anaoma
2. 1	voluimus	volumus Σ
2	prorsus summa hominum	summa hominum prorsus
	mense	ineunte Σ
3. 3	saepe scripsisti	scripsisti saepe
	hoc ad te	hec <eo> ad te Σ
4. 1	iam te	te iam
	reiecti	eiecti
	quod	quidem
3		<insigne> Σ
	signa	ornamenta

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
5. 2 fuerat	fuerit Σ
monerem	memorem
quae postea	postea quae
3 enim a	enim <et> a
4 statuerim	constituerim
scribere	rescribere Σ
unas	nullas (*in ras.*)
6 esse iam quod laborare-	esset quod iam laboraret
7 convenire [tur	conveniri Σ
6. 1 par mihi	in hac mihi Σ (hoc)
8. 2 xystique	isti qui
nam	non
efferimur	efferuntur
9. 2 dubitaris	dubites Σ
diligenter cures	cures diligenter Σ
10. 1 ibi essem	essem ibi
iam	tam
2 tantam ex epistula volup-	tanta epistula voluntatis
video gravem [tatem	gravem video
3 admoneret	commoveret (*corr. supra* com-
5 confido ita	ita confido [moneret)
6 communibus	omnibus
eo animo te	te animo eo
11. 1 mea sponte	mea <loca> sponte
eo accedebat	et accedebat
vestra	nostra
ne illud	ne illud <quidem>
significarem tibi	significare te
quae	quod
12. 1 centesimis nummum	concentesimus <sum> num-
nuntiant	veniat [mum
succedi oportere	oportere succedere
possim hominem defen-	possum honorem defendere
2 clientem [dere	dicentem
tamen	cum
4 M. Messalla M. Pisone	Messalla et Pisone
13. 1 tribus tabernis ut opinor	a tribus ei tabernis ut opinor
pure [ei	pueri
humanitatis sparse	humanitate sparsi
relevarit	revellarit

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
enim te	te enim
2 retinendam M², *om.* M¹	tenendam
nominis	non minus
si etiam	etiam si
tamen	tantum

(For the break which occurs here in Cod. Add. 6793, see the description of the MS on page 293.)

	Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
16. 9	iudicaremur	iudicaremus
	dolor accessit	doacrescit
10	dicas in operto	in opto dicas Σ (operto)
	tuo	nostro
	tui mentionem nullam	nllam tui mentionem
	spe devorarat	rem devorat
	putes quam	putes inquam Σ
11	faecem	fere
	coniuncti	coniuncta
12	sed senatus consulta	si senatus consultus
	putantur	putant
	magistratus	iurantus (*vide* Class. Rev., Sept.
13	Lurco autem tribunus	Lucro aut tribuno [1899)
	qui nummos	mimos qui
	tribubus	tribulibus Σ
	none locifacteon	non electi faten
15	chlylius (*in mg.* vel thli-	tilinus
	scripserit [lyus)	scripsit
16	quoi darem	quod darem
17	nunc	non
	suo est	suo sto
18	tibi alaquid	aliquid tibi
17. 1	tam ante	iam
	concuperem	concuperem <et>
	declararant	declarant Σ
2	animus ad	animus <et> ad Σ
	ut amor	aut amor Σ
	meos	eos
	totius vitium quod	potius victum quam
	presenti	praesertim
4	misit [nuitas)	nisi
5	integritas (*in mg.* inge-	<et> ingenuitas Σ

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
voluntatem institute vite	voluntatem tuam tute vite
minime	nimia
discessi M²	discessit
6 qui	quin Σ
an ipsis	an <in> ipsis
7 per quam te	propter quam <mihi> te
	aliquando <ante> Σ
estis	est
dissensione	discessione
8 ut de	ne de
non adfuissem	animi fuissem
id equestrem ordinem	id <quod> egestrem ordinem
9 conduxerunt	aduxerunt
se cupiditate	de cupiditate
locatio	locutio
auderent	laudarent
perfectumque ut	perfectumque <quos> ut
libentissimo (*in mg.* ⎱	liberalissimo
liberalissimo) ⎰	
10 tamen firma	infirma
quaedam nobis	<a> nobis quaedam
retinendas	retinendum
tuta ut spero	tuta sit spero
alias ad te	ad te alias
11 sed in	sed <me> in
modeste	moleste
18. 1 obtegam	detegam
et filiola	et <cum> filiola
consumitur	consultus (*or* -tur)

(Here occurs the break in Med., lasting to 19. 11 est ettalis.)

19. 11 mihi litterae	litterae mihi
20. 1 duco	dico
2 ratio	gratia
3 viros illos	illos viros Σ
4 ad te scripsi	scripsi ad te Σ
idem	iam
5 nuntiari gallia (*sed* ⎱	gallie non magis nuntiari per-
cum signis trans- ⎬	gaudet (*in mg.* magnopere)
positionis) non mag- ⎪	
nopere gaudet ⎰	

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
6 legerunt	legerent
7 me amas	amas me
illum	illis
	forensi <labore> ⅀
tibi ille agit	ille agit tibi

Liber II.

1. 1 iuniis	iulii
	<me> aliquanto ⅀
quia	quod
significas	notificas
tibi ego non essem	ego non essem tibi
3 civis ille tuus	tuus ille civis
quo	cum
habui ad populum	ad populum habui
meae delectant	me delectet
dixerim	dixerit
4 quod te [buere)	quo te
scribere (*in mg.* distri-	discribere
te istim M¹, te istinc M²	istim te
5 cum M¹, quom M²	quo minus
peteret	petent
plebeio rem publicam	plebeiorum publica ⅀ (pub-
puamisse et	puasisset ac [licam)
idem non ante itum M¹ ⎫	idem ante non esse itum
idem ante non est itum M² ⎭	
quo miri M¹, quom iri M²	quo in iri
habeat	habebat
eos esse in hoc essem M¹ ⎫	eos nihil esse
eos nihil mihi esse M² ⎭	
6 dissensio	discessio
ita praecautum	rei p. cautum
caesarem	cessaret (*corr. ex* cessare)
7 mihi nemo	nemo mihi
invideret	invidetur
exsecaret	seccaret
clivo	duro
8 face	faceret (*corr. ex* facere)
cato	cato <ne et> ⅀ (cato et)

	Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
	carcere incluso saepe	carcerem cluso sese
9	inhoneste	\<mihi\> honeste
	modeste	moleste
	dedisse	dedisset (*corr. ex* dedissem)
	nunc	nec
		\<cum\> lucceius
12	tum	tamen
	diligenter latinos	latinos diligenter Σ
2. 2	heredes lege hec	credas lege \<te\> hec
	illum mihi	mihi illum
3	sanus	.s.atius
3. 2	aiebatur idiorum	aeibat viridiorum
	lateis	lacteas
	fit	sit
	reprehenderis	prehenderis
	eiusmodi	cuiusmodi
3	socraticos	socrates
	nec	in re
	hunc	habet
	iuventae	vivente
	meo	in eo
	semper nobis	vobis semper
4. 1	quoniam nummorum	quorum nuntiorum
	cum ticinio	continuo
	pomponiae	pompeiane
2	ais	ait
	nobis est	est nobis
4	minus	nimis Σ
	publica cogitare	p. cigitare (*corr. ex* per gigi-
7	pomponiam et	pompeianam ut [tare)
5. 1	simul	simili
	satietate	sotietate
	rumusculos	rumos
2	uno	vicio
	initio	initiis
3	rescribere certius	rescribe recertius
	Clodio fratre omnia	Clodio fiat cum omnia
6. 1	peregrinationis	peregrinationibus
	sic enim	sed enim
	prorsus	potius

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
anti considam	ante confidam
tempus omne	tempus esse
diu nimirum	duumvirum
2	parasti \<kl.\>
saegium	senum
ubi	ut
	\<a nobis\> quae tibi
7. 1 libebat	libet
absciram	sciram
2 de Publio	dum Publio
ire	in re
salutare	resalutare Σ
bilem id commovet	bilem his commovet
curitates	cur ita res
3 ieiunata bella relegatio ⎫	haec ieiuna tabellarii legatio
(*in mg.* ei una tabel- ⎬	
laris legatio) ⎭	
est	sunt
4 pridem	pridie
gubernare me taedebat	gubernarem et debebat
8. 1 suavi	suavis
iocationem	iocacitatem
ego me do historiae	ego ad historiae
2 formiano	forma
spectare	expectare
9. 1 tuos	vos
abdis et addis (*in mg.* ⎫	abdis et audis
abdis et audis *quod* ⎬	
deletum est) ⎭	
posse mihi	mihi posse
ulla esse invidia	ulla [esse] \<in\> invidia
didiam	dianam
2 quid etiam M¹, quidnam	quid est
3 tantum [M²	tamen
habet a nobis etiamsi	habet et nobis et si
male vehi malle M¹	malo vehi malo E
terentia [(male M²)	terentiana
10. 1 quom velim	quam velim
antea tribus	ante ac tribus Σ (E -ac)
11. 1 eo si ante	et si ante

	Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
	fortasse	fortassis
12. 1	emitat	mittat
	duas	tuas
2	commode	commodum
	nepotis exprompsit odi-	nepoti expromisit odium
3	luculentus [um	luculentulus
13. 1	indignus	indignum
2	ferre	forem
	infremitus	firmitus
	ferret	fert
	qua re	quam
	ad sicyonios litteras	litteras ad Sicionos Ƨ
14. 2	pangende	pangendo
	crebro adhortaris	adhortaris <spe> crebro
	ceteri	certi
	sint	sane
	cogitationis	cognitionis
	parcetur labori	paratur labora
15. 1	delectat	delectet
2	ipsius	inpius
	sis advolaturus	sis advolatus
	sive ruet (M¹, *in mg.* servet M²) remp. }	si remp.
	certi nihil	nihil certi Ƨ
4	possideant	possident
16. 1	magis	magna
	improbaret	aprobaret et
	consoler	consuler
	quae mihi videtur	mihi vero
	contiuncula	contemelia
2	potuerit	poterit
	de caelo tum	tunc de celo
	fuerit	fierit
	qui appellantur boni qui	et appellabantur boni cum hi
	ullum [mihi	nullum
3	tuo cum	cum tuo
4	quid dicam	quiddam
	ait	ut
	eorum	coram
	contemnam	consentiam

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
17. 1 aditus sibi compararent	aditus si compararent
arpinati	arpinato
deflebimus	de flemmus
2 consolantur	consoletur
id	.IN
vacuusest hac etenim } (*in mg.* vacuus sum. consumi est) }	vacuus cum sim. hac (?) enim
3 theophane	tebosane
18. 1 tenemur	teneremur
huic plausus	huius plausus
2 exsecrationem in con- tu hoc silebis [tione	excitationem cum hoc silebis
4 deesset	esset
19. 1 proponuntur	opponuntur
2 putarem	putaram
populares	postulares (*so in* 20. 4)
filius est	filius eius
susceptum	scriptum
esse tamen	tum esse
4 neque vero	nam vero
adsumpsisse	sonsumpsisse
20. 1 defui	deserui
in amicitiam recepi	in amicitia recipi
varro	vere
	possum <addit.> (*probably*
2 etiam	et [*from two lines below*)
3 morbo	mortas
internecione	intervictione
4 contiones	condictiones
populare	postulare (*vid. supra*)
5 timeo sed	nebosed
et furio	ut furio
21. 1 molesta	modesto
iracundiam atque intem- nunc vero [perantiam	iracundia et intemperantia non vero
2 orbitam	orbitatem
3 amicus noster	noster amicus Σ
lapsus quam progressus	potius lapsus quam progressus
et ut Appelles [potius	.Et non appellem

21

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
videret	videretur
a me pictum	et me pictum
illum	illa
tamque	tamquam
5	iret <addiret>
6 contra me	circa me
spero me	me spero
ad tempus	tam tempus
agas	agam
22. 1 facturus	futurus
fors obtulerit	forit otulerit
haec egerunt	hoc gerunt
facturus	factum
opes et	opes eorum
iudicium minatur	iudicibus mitiatur
2 aiebat illum	alebat ipsus
	eius <modi>
4 mihi erunt	erunt mihi
5 autsine molestia	autem sine modestia
sentencias (*v. lect.—sen-*	sententiam est
non inutilis [*tias*)	utilis
23. 2 igitur illud	illud igitur
possem invenire	posse inveniri
deinde omnis	posse omnes
3 noster	nostrae
curre si curris	cure si curis
animorum	amicorum
24. 1 celeritatem	claritatem
2 eumque occidere	cumque cecidere
sane	sana
eiectum	electum
a. d. III	a tertio
3	ut <putarent> Vectius (*prob.*
liceret	licet [*from below*)
a Vatinio	ex Vatinio
M. Laterensem	militarensem
4 indicium	inditius
que	quam Σ
5 respiraro	respiramo
25. 1 allobrogum diceret	alobragum dicit
amantius	nantius

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*

Liber III.

	Med.	Add. 6793 Ma.
2. 1	correcta	corepta
	si recte haberem (M² *in*	si iter haberem
	luc. [*ras.*)	luci
4. 1	a Vibone	avibione
	eiusmodi	huiusmodi
	illoc M¹, illo M²	illuc
5	sin es	semes
	es Romae	seroine (*vel* seromine)
6	meos tibi	tibi meos Σ
7. 1	natura (*in mg.* nam ad)	nam
		traseunt <mihi>
	te non M¹, et te non M²	et nunc te
	interpretentur	interpreter
	illud	illuc
	abesse	abest
2	prosequebatur	prosequebamur
	ne et	neque et
	quam ad finem	sed a finem
3	properaris nos conse-	properas nos consequare
	ubi dimissurus [quere	indimissurus
8. 1	prope est et	prope esset Σ
	quicquam	quidem
2	audire fore ut	fiĕ ua
	data	tanta
	conturber	conturbor Σ
	meus me maerror	me meus dolor
3	tantum ego	tamen
	Hypsaeo	ipsco
	Maii	mali
4	te mentis meae motum	motum mentis meae
	scelere	scribere
	ac	et Σ
	vides	videas
	utinam iam	ut
	existimato	existimes
	nefarium non putarim	nephanum non putaris
	memor M¹, memoria M²	meror
	metus de fratre in scri- } bendo impedit }	metus de frate et scribendo impendit

Med.	*Add.* 6793 *Ma.*
maias M¹, iunias M²	ianuas
9. 1 discessisset	discessem
nostris malis	malis nostris
enim	ei
altera acerbitate	alteram acerbitatem
2 eius	huius
tecum haec omnia age- mus coram M¹ tecum haec omnia co- ram agemus M²	haec tecum coram agemus
optimo genere facere	optimo tempore facere
3 unum	minus
10. 1 aliquid aliud	aliud aliquid
2 et quis	hec quis
calamitatis genus	genus calamitatis
offerrem	offenderem
3 quam quod	quamquam
quae si	quod si
plurimis	pluribus
11. 1 expecto	expectato
12. 2 scripta mihi	mihi scripta
ceterae	certe
3 donatam ut	donata uti
13. 1 statueram	constatueram
neque	ineque
qui nobis	per nobis
cum nuntiant	eum enuntiant
2 scelere	inscelere
14. 1 remorare	rememorare
correxerint	correxerit
2 me adhuc	adhuc me
neque	nam
15. 1	(*Ma desinit cum litteris* confi-, *verbi* confirmandum)

The following is the list of cases where *Ma* omits words which are found in M :—

Liber I: 1. 1 videtur; 1. 4 mihi, me; 2. 2 mihi (*twice*); 5. 7 tu; 6. 2 mihi; 10. 2 ante, quia; 10. 5 signa; 10. 6 quasi; 11. 1 ille, tam ... modo, putaris; 12. 4 quid ... conturbatior; 13. 2 esse,

et; 16. 9 est; 16. 11 quod illa, et; 16. 13 aelia iniit; 16. 17 uno
. . . es; 17. 5 tibi neque; 17. 6 maxime, non domesticae; 17. 7
tuis; 17. 8 valde, ecce . . . ornavi; 17. 9 ut; 17. 11 ut . . . venias;
18. 1 homo, autem; 20. 1 et; 20. 2 neque . . . veniendum; 20. 7
quos XXX libris.

Liber II : 1. 1 omnis, ut; 1. 3 et; 1. 4 est; 1. 5 etiam; 1. 6 ita;
1. 7 ego; 1. 11 mea, valde; 1. 12 tuo . . . suus; 2. 1 cinos; 2. 3
venire, de; 4. 2 an; 5. 1 unus, praedicarant; 6. 2 hic, spes; 7. 1
eum; 7. 5 filio, pueros; 9. 1 esse; 9. 2 nonis; 11. 1 etiam; 12. 2
ipsis Cerealibus, in, quam . . . lituis; 12. 3 id, mihi; 14. 1 mihi,
ne, cum . . . sermonibus; 15. 2 praeclarum; 15. 4 et; 16. 1 homi-
num; 16. 2 nihil; 17. 1 quid . . . possunt; 17. 2 ne; 18. 2 ager;
19. 1 et, dignitatis . . . fortasse; 19. 2 turpe tam; 19. 4 tu . . .
faciam; 21. 1 tibi; 21. 3 se; 21. 4 subito, vidi, ita, et; 21. 5 se;
21. 6 mihi; 23. 1 cum; 23. 2 consensionem, nam; 24. 2 ille, est,
in, suis; 24. 3 iusserat . . . loco; 24. 4 taedet ita (*spat. rel.*); 24. 5
omni in cogitatione; 25. 2 te.

Liber III : 2. 1 ex; 7. 1 alias; 8. 3 video; 9. 1 a, ille; 10. 1
ista; 10. 2 est, ne, aut; 13. 2 si; 14. 2 in.

This is a large list, and proves that the copyist of this MS was
very careless, for there is no reason to suppose that most of these
omissions are real variants. If a similar number of omissions can
be shown to exist in any number of other MSS of this class, the
value of the class will be very considerably depreciated.

The result of the study of this MS up to this point is to show
that it is derived from a source independent of M, and closely
allied with, if not the same as, the MSS of the Σ class. For, out
of 38 readings in the first two books from Σ MSS, Add. 6793 has
34. Further, that so far as value is concerned, this MS—and by
implication those like it—are far less important than M, although
they do preserve the better readings in some cases.

We turn now to Codex Burneius 146, a paper MS of the 15th
century. It is quarto in size, each leaf measuring 28.4×20.5
centimetres, and containing 35 lines. There are 239 folia, but the
last three are not written on. The MS is well written and pre-
served, and the different books are marked by illuminations of
the ordinary sort. Each letter begins with the salutation written
in red ink, except in the 12th and 13th books, where the text is,
as usual, continuous. Space was always left for the Greek words,
and these were usually but not always supplied by a later hand,

with glosses in the margin in the scribe's own hand.   The curious character of these glosses has been noted by Purser.

The MS contains: (1) ff. 1–7v, Nepotis Vita P. Attici; (2) ff. 7v–19r, epist. ad Brutum lib. I; (3) ff. 19r–45v, epist. ad Q. Fratrem lib. III; (4) ff. 45v–47v, epist. ad Octavianum; (5) ff. 47v–236v, epist. ad Atticum lib. XVI (complete).

(1) The following is a list of those cases where Burn. 146 agrees with Add. 6793 against the readings of the Medicean, in the first two books—that is, in nearly all of the text copied in Add. by *Ma.*

Burn. 146, *Add.* 6793.	*Med.*
Liber I.	
1. 1 iurant	curavit
licere	lucere
2 videatur	videantur
informata (*Add.* inforata)	adhuc informata
3 ventitet [adhuc	veniret (*in mg.* ventitet)
4 <ne contra>	
sumus	simus
2. 1 ad te rationibus	detractionibus (*in mg.* a te
3. 1 saufeium	fauseium [rationibus)
3 hoc <eo> ad te Σ	
4. 1 te iam	iam te
3 <insigne> Σ	
5. 2 fuerit Σ	fuerat
4 rescribere Σ	scribere
10. 1 roma	romam
12. 1 praetor [nor dedisti	preter
13. 1 tribus ei tabernis ut opi-	tribus tabernis ut opinor ei de-
16. 10 in operto (*Burn.* aperto)	dicas in operto [disti
13 tribulibus Σ [dicas Σ	tribubus
17. 2 animus <et> ad Σ	
aut amor Σ	ut amor
6 an <in> ipsis Σ	
quin Σ	qui
9 laudarent	auderent
11 moleste	modeste
20. 1 et Σ	ei
3 illos viros Σ	viros illos
4 iam	idem

Burn. 146, *Add.* 6793.	*Med.*
scripsi ad te Σ	ad te scripsi
7 forensi \<labore\> Σ	

Liber II.

1. 1 \<me\> aliquanto Σ	
3 tuus ille civis	civis ille tuus
4 describere (*Add.* discri-	scribere (*in mg.* distribuere)
5 ipso \<etiam\> [bere)	
7 nemo mihi	mihi nemo
9 miloni	moloni
3. 2 prehenderis	reprehenderis
5. 3 rescribe recertius	rescribere recertius
fiat et	fratre (fre *cum arcu*)
6. 2 \<a nobis\> quae tibi	
8. 1 ecquid (*Add.* hec quid)	et quid
9. 3 malo Σ (E) [Σ (E)	malle M¹, male M²
10. 1 quam	quom
13. 2 litteras ad sicyonios Σ	ad sicyonios litteras
16. 2 si	sibi
17. 2 videretur	viderentur
24. 2 electum	eiectum
3 aut in	ut in

(2) The next list contains those cases where Burn. 146 disagrees with both Add. 6793 and Med., which have here the same readings.

Burn. 146.	*Med., Add.* 6793.

Liber I.

1. 4 evenirem	venirem
9. 1 nostrum illum	illum nostrum
11. 3 nostrae academiae Σ	academiae nostrae
iam odium	odium iam
12. 1 letalius	lentulus
16. 9 \<in\> ignorando	
retinere	retinete
10 quid inquit \<quid\>	
reges	regem
12 inique	in que
que in	quod in

	Burn. 146.	*Med., Add.* 6793.

14	instare	in ista re
	profecturus	profectus
17. 3	vulneribus	volneris
10	ergo	ego
11	<te> expectare	
	velim	velis
20. 1	et ingenii Σ (E)	sed ingenii

Liber II.

1. 2	instarant	instabant
4	signas	significas
5	se petere	sepe
6	illa optima	optima illa
7	collocatam	collocaram
8	num	non
10	expectat te	te expectat
11	illud	illum
2. 2	malim	mallem
3	et quid	hec quid
3. 3	nam <si> fuit	
4. 1	ostenderas	ostenderat
	voluptate	voluntate
3	huius <modi>	
5. 1	si nihil	si enim
	tamen	tum
6. 2	multo asperiore	asperiore multo
7. 5	non	nos
8. 2	voluimus	volumus
9. 1	iocundius esse	esse iocundius
	purissimus	putissimus
11. 1	nihil scire	scire nihil
	ad	da
12. 3	habebit	habebis
14. 1	apud	quod
2	vidi	vide M¹, vides M², *Add.*
15. 1	multo	nullo
16. 1	perlatum	prolatum
4	scribit	scribis
	quid	qui

Burn. 146.	Med., Add. 6793.
17. 1 comparari	compararent
3 velim <te>	
18. 1 fore	scire
cuiquam	cuiusquam
19. 4 bonum	bonorum
ullum	illum
factum	facturum
5 certissimum	certissimus
autem	aut
20. 4 quodam novo	novo quodam
21. 1 lenius	lenibus
22. 2 sententia	summa
23. 3 breviter	brevitate
24. 1 non	novi
2 prospicimus	perspicimus

(3) The third list contains those cases (in these two books) where Burn. 146 disagrees with both Add. 6793 and Med.

Burn. 146.	Add. 6793.	Med.
Liber I.		
6. 1 par in hoc Σ	in hac	par
11. 1 potest tam	*om.*	tam potest
13. 2 non nimis	non minus	nominis
16. 13 non floci fac-teon	non electi faten	none locifacteon
17 in loco es	*om.*	inlo es
17. 1 iam inte	iam	tam ante
7 tuis amicis	amicis	amicis tuis
20. 2 civium Σ	tum	cum
Liber II.		
1. 5 eos nihil in nos esse	eos nihil esse	{ eos esse in hoc esse M[1] { eos nihil mihi esse M[2]
2. 2 hec lege	lege te hec	lege hec
3. 2 agebatur	aiebat	aiebatur
6. 2 unum est salvum	vivum est senum	{ vivum est saegium M[1] { vivum esse M[2] *in mg.*
12. 2 emersam	emere seram	emerseram

Burn. 146.	*Add.* 6793.	*Med.*
13. 2 fremitus	firmitus	infremitus
14. 2 si	sane	sint
19. 1 omitto	ad mitto	ac mitto
te profecto te	*om.*	{ profecto te M[1] te profecto M[2]
3 tamen esse	tum esse	esse tamen
20. 5 me et furio	ut furio	et furio
22. 2 ad	eiusmodi	eius
5 sentias	sententiam est	sentencias
24. 4 que omnino	quam oratio	que oratio

As has been remarked, there is a break in the text of Cod. Add. 6793 between I 13. 2 and 16. 9. Lehmann cites eight readings from MSS of the Σ class occurring in this passage. In all of them Burn. 146 agrees with Σ, and not with Med.

Burn. 146, Σ.	*Med.*
14. 1 tamen <ita>	
vix huic	huic vix
coeperit	ceperat
2 ab se	abs te
5 facile ex altera parte	ex altera parte facile
16. 2 ut <id> ita	
5 praesidio	prescio
8 in ea	mea

Again, a comparison of the readings quoted by Lehmann from books III–XVI shows that in 108 out of 148 cases, Burn. 146 agrees with Med. against Σ.

Limiting the discussion for the present to the first two books, the result of these various comparisons seems to be:

(1) Burn. 146 agrees much more closely with M than with Add. 6793 or with the Σ class. Thus, out of 38 readings in these two books cited from Σ MSS, Burn. has 20, while Add. has 34.

(2) The cases where Burn. does exhibit the readings of Σ are too numerous and important to be due to ordinary copyists' errors.

(3) The cases where Burn. disagrees with both M and Add. are mostly of such a kind as can be explained as ordinary errors,

but some (e. g. lib. I, 12. 1; 16. 14; lib. II, 5. 1; 17. 1; 19. 4) are undoubtedly due to intentional alterations by the scribe.

The general conclusion from these separate results must be that this MS represents a hybrid tradition, and that it is derived from a MS which was itself the result of a Medicean text emended by readings from the Σ class and with still further arbitrary changes. Further certainty can only be reached by a comparison with a complete collation of ENORP. Add. 6793 gives no help here because it is perfectly sure that only the first 53 ff. represent the Σ tradition. It may be true, as Purser thinks, that the agreement between Burn. and Σ is less marked beyond the second book. A discussion of the relations of these MSS and the others in the Museum, in their later portions, must be reserved for another paper.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

V.—THE STRUCTURE OF DIONYSII HALICARNAS-
SENSIS EPISTULA II AD AMMAEUM.

With the plan and the specifications before one, it ought not to
be hard to discern how far the completed work fulfils the contract.
Dionysius, in the opening of his second letter to Ammaeus, sets
forth so clearly the outline of his work and his method of
procedure that discrepancies and omissions in the treatise as
preserved to us may be easily detected.

In response to a request of Ammaeus, Dionysius proposes first
to repeat what he has previously said about Thucydides, and
then to take up each point and adduce in proof examples from
the historian. Accordingly, he begins with a passage from the
De Thucydide Iudicium, quoted almost without change. He
then proceeds to a detailed and systematic exposition of the
statements made, and thereafter immediately brings the letter to
a close. A careful comparison, therefore, of chapters III–XVII
with the preliminary outline in chapter II (a passage fortunately
supported by double tradition) should show us whether the
treatise has suffered loss or disarrangement.

The theses of chapter II may be disposed as follows:

(*a*) ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων τὴν τροπικὴν καὶ γλωττηματικὴν καὶ
ἀπηρχαιωμένην καὶ ξένην λέξιν παραλαμβάνων πολλάκις ἀντὶ τῆς κοινῆς
καὶ συνήθους τοῖς καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν ἀνθρώποις,

(*b*) ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν σχηματισμῶν . . . τοτὲ μὲν λόγον ἐξ ὀνόματος ποιῶν,

(*c*) τοτὲ δὲ εἰς ὄνομα συνάγων τὸν λόγον·

(*d*) καὶ νῦν μὲν τὸ ῥηματικὸν ὀνοματικῶς ἐκφέρων,

(*e*) αὖθις δὲ τοὔνομα ῥῆμα ποιῶν·

(*f*) καὶ αὐτῶν γε τούτων ἀναστρέφων τὰς χρήσεις, ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὀνοματικὸν
<προσηγορικὸν γένηται,

(*g*) τὸ δὲ προσηγορικὸν ὀνοματικῶς>[1] λέγηται,

(*h*) καὶ τὰ μὲν παθητικὰ ῥήματα δραστήρια,

---

[1] ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὀνοματικὸν λέγηται PG; ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὀνοματικὸν ῥηματικόν, τὸ δὲ
ῥηματικὸν ὀνοματικὸν λέγηται inpudenti interpolatione CD: orationem mancam
ex Θ [De Thuc. Iud., c. 24, p. 867 Reisk.] supplendam esse vidit Reiskius.—
Usener.

(*i*) τὰ δὲ δραστήρια παθητικά·

(*j*) πληθυντικῶν δὲ καὶ ἑνικῶν ἀλλάττων τὰς φύσεις καὶ ἀντικατηγορῶν ταῦτα ἀλλήλων,

(*k*) θηλυκά τ' ἀρρενικοῖς καὶ ἀρρενικὰ θηλυκοῖς καὶ οὐδέτερα τουτοισὶ συνάπτων, ἐξ ὧν ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθία πλανᾶται·

(*l*) τὰς δὲ <τῶν> ὀνοματικῶν ἢ μετοχικῶν πτώσεις τοτὲ μὲν πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος ἀποστρέφων,

(*m*) τοτὲ δὲ πρὸς τὸ σημαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαινομένου·

(*n*) ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνδετικοῖς καὶ τοῖς προθετικοῖς μορίοις καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς διαρθροῦσι τὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων δυνάμεις ποιητοῦ τρόπον ἐνεξουσιάζων.

(*o*) πλεῖστα δ' ἄν τις εὕροι παρ' αὐτῷ τῶν σχημάτων, προσώπων τε ἀποστροφαῖς

(*p*) καὶ χρόνων ἐναλλαγαῖς

(*q*) καὶ τοπικῶν[1] σημειώσεων μεταφοραῖς ἐξηλλαγμένα καὶ σολοικισμῶν λαμβάνοντα φαντασίας·

(*r*) ὁπόσα τε γίνεται πράγματα ἀντὶ σωμάτων

(*s*) ἢ σώματα ἀντὶ πραγμάτων,

(*t*) καὶ ἐφ' ὧν ἐνθυμημάτων τε καὶ νοημάτων αἱ μεταξὺ παρεμπτώσεις πολλαὶ γινόμεναι διὰ μακροῦ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν κομίζονται,

(*u*) τά τε σκολιὰ καὶ πολύπλοκα καὶ δυσεξέλικτα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ συγγενῆ τούτοις.

(*v*) εὕροι δ' ἄν τις οὐκ ὀλίγα καὶ τῶν θεατρικῶν σχημάτων κείμενα παρ' αὐτῷ, τὰς παρισώσεις λέγω καὶ παρομοιώσεις καὶ παρονομασίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις, ἐν αἷς ἐπλεόνασε Γοργίας ὁ Λεοντῖνος καὶ οἱ περὶ Πῶλον καὶ Λικύμνιον καὶ πολλοὶ ἄλλοι τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἀκμασάντων.

Now, how closely do the expository chapters conform to this outline?

Chapter III deals with the first topic (*a*). Instead of the terms τροπικός, γλωττηματικός, ἀπηρχαιωμένος, ξένος, are found γλωσσηματικός, ἀπηρχαιωμένος, δυσείκαστος, and ποιητικός; but these variations are unimportant.

The following chapter presents a difficulty. It begins, it is true, with the subject of periphrasis (*b*), and ends with that of brachylogy (*c*); but as the text stands, the transition is not clear. The chapter reads: ὅταν μὲν οὖν μίαν λέξιν εἴτε ὀνοματικὴν εἴτε ῥηματικὴν

---

[1] This is the reading of the manuscripts here and in the De Thuc. Iudicium. Krüger wrote τροπικῶν, and has been followed by van Herwerden and Usener. It seems possible, however, to keep the manuscript reading and understand a reference to Thucydides' proleptic use of prepositions and adverbs of place, e. g. II 5, 29; V 52, 11. This is favored by the coupling with χρόνων.

ἐν πλείοσιν ὀνόμασιν ἢ ῥήμασιν ἐκφέρῃ περιφράζων τὴν αὐτὴν νόησιν, τοιαύτην ποιεῖ τὴν λέξιν· "ἦν γὰρ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς βεβαιότατα δὴ φύσεως ἰσχὺν δηλώσας καὶ διαφερόντως τι ἐς αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ἑτέρου ἄξιος θαυμάσαι." καὶ μὴν ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ γέγραφεν· "οὐδ' αὖ κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων δέ τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι τὴν πόλιν, ἀξιώματος ἀφανείᾳ κεκώλυται." καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις τὸ σημαινόμενον ποιεῖ τὸν λόγον τοιοῦτον, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου Βρασίδα τέθηκεν, ὅτε μαχόμενος περὶ Πύλον ἀπὸ τῆς νεὼς τραυματίας γενόμενος ἐξέπεσεν· "πεσόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ" φησίν "εἰς τὴν παρεξειρεσίαν ἡ ἀσπὶς περιερρύη·" βούλεται γὰρ δηλοῦν· "πεσόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἔξω τῆς νεὼς ἐπὶ τὰ προέχοντα μέρη τῆς εἰρεσίας." Krüger's proposition to read for τὸ σημαινόμενον, σχηματίζων ὄνομα and regard κατὰ πενίαν as a substitute for πένης μὲν ὤν, according to Dionysius' criticism, τοτὲ δὲ εἰς ὄνομα συνάγων τὸν λόγον, is taken up by Usener, who, passing over van Herwerden's suggestion of a lacuna,[1] emends τὸ σημαινόμενον to τὸ σύντομον and accepts the interpretation given by Krüger to the passage. To this interpretation there are several objections. Apart from the fact that κατὰ πενίαν is scarcely more concise than πένης μὲν ὤν, the transition from periphrasis to brachylogy is made through καὶ μήν alone; an example is introduced before the statement of that which it illustrates; and the passage violates the usage of the writer, since ποιεῖ τὸν λόγον and similar expressions are throughout the epistle used with a personal subject. There seems to be no doubt that there is a lacuna after τὸ σημαινόμενον; for (save here) up to the long citations in chapters XV and XVI, Dionysius uniformly points out the particulars in which he criticizes the passages quoted, and gives what is in his view a more natural rendering. In the present sentence, καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις τὸ σημαινόμενον is the introduction to this explanation. Compare chapter VII (p. 797, 8), καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις; chapter X (799, 13), καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα; chapter VII (797, 4) and chapter X (799, 14), ἦν δὲ τὸ σημαινόμενον.

In chapters V and VI the use of nouns for verbs (*d*) and the use of verbs for nouns (*e*) are considered in due order.

The next topic in the outline (according to the emendation demanded by the text of the De Thucydide Iudicium) is the substitution of τὸ προσηγορικόν for τὸ ὀνοματικόν and *vice versa* (*f*), (*g*). But since chapter VII opens with a question of voice (*h*), it is evident that a lacuna should be noted between chapters VI and VII.

Chapters VII, VIII and IX handle, respectively, the use of the

---

[1] "Intactum reliqui locum corruptissimum . . . neque ipse reperi quod satisfaceret. Vereor autem, ne quid exciderit post σημαινόμενον."

active for the passive (*h*), the use of the passive for the active (*i*), and interchange of number (*j*).

In the succeeding chapters there is not a little confusion. The tenth has to do with gender, yet not as regards agreement (*k*), but as regards word-forms involving an unusual gender, e. g. ὁ ὄχλος for ἡ ὄχλησις, τὸ βουλόμενον for ἡ βούλησις. The eleventh begins with the subject of declensional forms: ἐν οἷς δὲ τὰς πτώσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν προσηγοριῶν καὶ τῶν μετοχῶν καὶ <τῶν> συναπτομένων τούτοις ἄρθρων ἐξαλλάττει τοῦ συνήθους, οὕτως σχηματίζει τὴν φράσιν· but nothing is said here of the πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος of (*l*). The illustrative passage cited from Thucydides contains, however, an example of construction κατὰ σύνεσιν, as well as examples of case-usage at variance with the customary idiom. The twelfth chapter treats of tenses; and at the close there is a slight digression caused by the fact that a citation from Thucydides contains a solecism in point of agreement in case. The thirteenth chapter takes up the subject of grammatical *versus* logical agreement, a matter already touched upon in chapter XI; but whereas gender was there concerned, the present section deals with variation in number. The statement of the subject of the paragraph, however,—ὅταν δὲ πρὸς τὸ σημαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαινομένου πράγματος τὴν ἀποστροφὴν ποιῆται ἢ πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος, οὕτως σχηματίζει τὸν λόγον—supplements the statement in chapter XI in such a way that the two combined repeat the phraseology of (*l*) and (*m*), but with different division. Since the fourteenth chapter considers the question of πράγματα ἀντὶ σωμάτων and σώματα ἀντὶ πραγμάτων, (*r*) and (*s*)—though in reverse order—it is obvious that much has fallen out between chapters XIII and XIV; and following the lead of Krüger, later editors have marked a lacuna in the text. Transposition, moreover, is necessary in order to bring chapter XII into its proper place; for, as has been said, this treats of tenses (*p*), and is clearly a rescued fragment of the section lost.[1] The other irregularities seem the result of hastiness or carelessness on the part of the author.

The remaining chapters—XV, XVI, XVII—explain in proper course the topics given in (*t*), (*u*), (*v*); and, save the omission of παρονομασία in the enumeration in chapter XVII, there is no discrepancy in the restatement of the points of criticism.

<div align="right">WINIFRED WARREN.</div>

[1] A hint as to the exposition of (*o*) may be found in De Thuc. Iud., p. 935, 15 sqq.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges, by GEORGE M. LANE, Ph. D., LL. D.   New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1898.   Pp. xv + 572.

A Latin grammar is a condensed statement of the facts and principles of a rather dry science, and it might naturally be inferred that such a book would be entirely impersonal. But a comparison of the grammars now in use in this country—especially if the observation be quickened by some personal acquaintance with the authors—will show that they contain a surprising infusion of the human element, and will convince one that a grammar may be a very direct product of temperament and even a revelation of personality.

Professor Lane was of that older generation of scholars who maintained the position of our colleges in the middle years of the century by their power as men and as teachers. Being, as it appears to us, to a considerable degree free from the distraction into many fields which perplexes their successors, they were able to interpret their duty more simply. They were professors "of the Latin language and literature," as the title still runs in some of our catalogues, and it was their duty, first, to know thoroughly the most important Latin authors—it may be questioned whether we know them as well—and, second, to know Latin grammar. And this second requirement may be even further limited, for the science of phonetics did not exist, morphology meant paradigms, and therefore Latin grammar meant syntax.

The tradition of this ideal of scholarship is, of course, English. But Professor Lane was one of that remarkable band of scholars who began the importation to this country of German scientific methods and who have so deeply influenced American scholarship by their teaching and their writings. The value of the German method, however, did not lead him, as it has sometimes led younger scholars, to abandon entirely the ideals of his earlier training. It appears to have been rather his aim to combine English scholarship, sound and broad and elegant—one instinctively selects words of an older generation to describe it—with the penetrating and constructive science of Germany. It is a noble ideal; to most of us, one must confess, quite unattainable; and it is the key to an understanding of Professor Lane's plan and to an intelligent appreciation of the value of his work.

In the first place, Professor Lane chose to do his work at firsthand. Professor Morgan in the preface says that his method

"was far from that of a compiler," and many of his colleagues and pupils know with what immense patience he labored to attain the highest possible degree of accuracy. The examples are plainly of his own gathering, and their number and variety constitute one of the most striking features of the book. Where a choice was necessary, there is abundant evidence of careful selection of those which most broadly and precisely illustrate the principle under discussion. Often, where the principle is stated in only a single general form, the examples are subdivided into classes on some easily perceived basis. Sections 1331–1341, covering a little more than a page, contain some 80 examples; among them there is not an error in citation, not a case where the text is doubtful, nor a slip of any kind; the spelling *Accherunti* is of course deliberately chosen, to account for the quantity of the first syllable. In other places where I have tested the references, the same high standard of accuracy is maintained. In other words, one may use the book with confidence and may trust the references—so far as that is ever permissible—without further examination.

With the accuracy and first-hand knowledge go also a certain directness of vision and a simplicity and originality of phrasing. This appears in the substitution of expressive headings for technical terms. The main divisions of the grammar are Sounds, Words, Sentences; interrogative sentences are Yes or No Questions and Pronoun Questions. Under the dative there is a distinction between the Essential Complement (1180) and the Optional Complement (1205, the dative "may be added at option to almost any verb"). So in 1207, "the dative is often added to the entire sentence"; in 1223, "a few datives are used to denote what a thing is intended to be"; 1219, ". . . what a thing tends to, proves, or is." Headings like The Emotional Dative, The Infinitive of Intimation, are the product of careful and independent thought, and may therefore be highly suggestive to one to whom the ordinary technical term has become a worn counter. There are, however, cases where this runs over into a new and not very successful sort of technical language, as where an *ut*-clause in which *ut* means *as* is called "the protasis of a comparative period" or the term "intermediate co-ordinate sentence" is used of all kinds of parataxis.

In the second place, it was clearly impossible for a man of Professor Lane's temperament to formulate even the most strictly scientific statement of facts without giving a coloring, a flavor, which makes it in some sense a piece of literature. The most striking evidence of this is in the translation of the examples, which is perhaps the first thing to catch the attention upon opening the book. The examples in verse, even when they consist of only a word or two, are rendered into rhythmical English (*hostiumst potita*, "into the foemen's hands she fell"; *scyphis pugnare Thracum est*, "to fight with bowls is Vandal work"); the collo-

22

quial style is preserved (*quam mox inruimus?* "how soon do we pitch in?" *temporibus errasti,* "you have slipped up in your chronology"); the annalistic style is imitated (*duplicatur civium numerus. Caelius additur urbi mons,* "number of citizens doubled; Mt. Caelius added to city"). Examples from Plautus or Terence are often rendered into the style of the earlier English comedy (*ego sycophantam iam conduco de foro,* "for me, a sharper from the market-place I'll straight engage"). Such translations are a most delightful corrective of the mechanical translation habits into which pupil and teacher are alike prone to fall. And the whole tone of the book must, I think, be understood to be a deliberate protest against the notion that science is necessarily dry and unindividual and devoid of humor.

In the third place, it was Professor Lane's declared purpose to write a grammar of facts, with the smallest possible admixture of theory. Strictly, a grammar of facts without theory is an impossibility, for the systematic presentation of the facts implies an underlying theory of their relations, logical, pedagogical or historical. But Professor Lane has succeeded in confining his theory almost to the form of presentation. It would be interesting to know what influences led him to choose such a plan. Possibly Madvig's Grammar or Andrews' and Stoddard's—the one-hundredth edition of this excellent manual is dated 1868—may have had their share in determining his choice of this plan; possibly he may have been skeptical as to the value of syntactical theorizing. At any rate, it is the plan of avoiding theory and holding fast to facts which gives the book its unique position and to which most of its excellence and its one serious defect are due.

The plan of adhering strictly to facts is especially ill-adapted to the treatment of sounds. In phonology the facts by themselves are nothing; they have value only as they establish or illustrate the working of law. Thus the statement under Diphthong Decay (§§80 ff.), that in *plaustrum* "*a* and *u* converged into *ō*," is in truth no more than to state, what every boy at once feels, that *plaustrum* and *plostrum* are different forms of one word, with the added suggestion of a figure—convergence—which is quite out of place here. This is true also of the general statement (§69) that "a stronger vowel often sinks to a weaker one," with examples of *paro, impero; factus, perfectus.* Phonologists would probably express still more strongly their dissatisfaction with §114, "In some instances one consonant takes the place of another," and §115, "*l* in some words arises from *d.*" The fault in all this is in the plan. The form of presentation, the attempt to state the facts of sound-change without reference to the laws, involves a theory which, fundamentally, takes account only of the written character and not of the sound or of the organs of speech, and this is a practical denial of all that has been learned of phonetic law during a half-century. That Professor Lane was not ignorant of this science (he alludes in §70 to the effect of the prefixing of a syllable

and to the early regressive accent) is of course quite certain, but his general plan led him to adopt a scheme of arrangement apparently simple and obvious, which in the end results in confusion, because it obscures law. It would seem possible to substitute for these sections a brief statement of the nature and working of phonetic laws, illustrated by familiar examples and avoiding points of controversy, which would be of real value to the advanced undergraduate student.

Of the morphology nothing more need be said than has been said above of the book as a whole. Accuracy is here the supreme virtue, and Professor Lane was supremely accurate. One comment may be made upon the sections on word-formation, §§180 ff. Professor Lane's unhampered directness leads him frequently to see that a formative termination may often carry a considerable variety of meaning. Thus §269, on diminutives—which, by the way, contains some very pretty illustrations of happy translation—will give aid and comfort, all the stronger because it is evidently unintended, to those who are disposed to emphasize the unsystematic character of word-formation and inflection.

In the syntax the conditions which make Professor Lane's plan ill-adapted to a presentation of phonology are exactly reversed; the presentation of facts in the simplest possible form is precisely the method which is in most complete harmony with and even to some degree in advance of the tendencies of investigation. The work of the last half-century in syntax has been, first, in the direction of freeing the science from the hindrances imposed by logical and metaphysical conceptions, and, second, in the recognition of the fact that scientific syntax has an aim of its own, which it must follow without regard to pedagogical considerations. The work has been largely negative, especially in the field of case-syntax. Here, as long as the conflict between localistic and grammatical theories of the cases is undecided, the best that can be expected of a grammar is that it shall present the usages and groupings in a clear-cut and unprejudiced way, and this expectation is best met by the ignoring, for the present, of all theory. To take a section at random, in the treatment of the Judicial Genitive (§§1280–1282) Professor Lane gives a very good list of general examples, a number of alternative constructions (and this is rather frequent throughout the book) such as *nomine, de vi, capite,* the gen. of the penalty (distinguished from the gen. of the charge), and some prepositional constructions. In comparison with some other American grammars—a comparison which the reviewer can not fairly avoid—Lane lacks a list of verbs which by transfer of meaning are used as verbs of accusing, he omits Cicero's *postulare,* the constructions with *ad* and *in,* the use of *voti,* and of course all theory, which in this particular instance happens to be interesting. This rather long list of omissions may make the impression that the grammar is not as full as others. Such an impression, however, would be removed by a comparison,

for example, of the sections on the ablative, which fill over 20 pages, or the sections on the dative, 8 pages, much of it in fine print. In this part of the grammar, the case-syntax, the reader will find neither marked superiority nor any inferiority; he will find, what he ought to expect in any good grammar, a slightly different and suggestive view of the facts, a new shading, often expressed in such phrases as have been referred to above—the Complementary Dative, the Emphasizing or Defining Accusative, the Genitive with Verbs of Participation and Mastery, the Ablative of the Route Taken. Originality and directness and vividness are very precious qualities, rarely combined, as here, with patient accuracy.

In the study of the sentence, however, the half-century has made one great and positive gain—namely, the discovery and application of the principle that all subordination is to be explained by reference to a paratactic stage. This principle is everywhere recognized in investigation and has brought about a gradual but complete revolution in the views and methods of students of syntax. A gap now divides the investigating science from the school manuals, which in kind, though not in degree, is like the gap which divides physics and chemistry from the old Natural Philosophy. That the school-books should be slow in adopting the very latest scientific theory is natural and wise; no other course could be justified; the clamor to have school-books "embody the latest results of investigation" is usually an ignorant clamor. But as long ago as 1874 Jolly (Schulgrammatik und Sprachwissenschaft) suggested that the traditional classification of subordinate clauses by function should be abandoned and a formal classification, into *qui*-clauses, *quod*-clauses, etc., should take its place. It is the great, the unique merit of Lane's Grammar that here the scientific system is for the first time used in a grammar "for schools and colleges." This point must be illustrated at length.

The main divisions of the subordinate clause are given in §1714; they are introduced by "I. Interrogative words, in indirect questions; II. Relative pronouns; III. Relative conjunctive particles, or conjunctive particles not of relative origin." The relative sentence is first taken up in a general way, and here Professor Lane so far departs from his plan as to speak of the origin of *qui* from *quis*, not, I venture to think, with any great gain, since the common statement that *quae mutat, ea corrumpit* is a modification of *quae mutat? ea corrumpit* is a bit of vague and useless guess-work. Then follow sections on the agreement of the pronoun, on the relative with the indicative, and last on the relative with the subjunctive. Only under the last head is there a functional classification, clauses of purpose, of characteristic, etc. Following the relative are the Conjunctive Particle Sentences, clauses introduced by *quod*, *quia*, etc. According to the suggestion in §1714, they are, in general, arranged according

to the closeness of their connection with *qui*, so that *quod*, *quia*, *quom* head the list and *si* and its compounds close it. To this order there are a few exceptions ; *dum* and *donec* stand after *quin* and before *quando*, and *simul atque* is grouped functionally with *ubi*; with these is also placed *ut* introducing a clause of repeated action, although the other uses of *ut* are all put together. These are slight concessions, apparently, to convenience, but I do not think they are improvements upon a more rigid scheme. Somewhat more serious is the fact that Professor Lane, though he places the particles of interrogative origin, like *quin* and probably *ut*, in the middle of the list, does not quite clearly recognize the fact that the history of an interrogative word like *quin* is as different from the history of *quod* or *quom* as *quod* is different from *dum* or *si*. Yet it must be confessed that it is extremely difficult to separate the interrogative from the relative elements in *quam* or *ubi*. Professor Lane's system is distinctly superior to Schmalz's attempt to arrange the subordinating conjunctions by their case-forms, an attempt which in our scanty knowledge must always leave much of uncertainty and which, if it could be successful, would be comparatively insignificant, since the case of the relative word exerts but a trifling influence upon the clause which it introduces. Neither *ne* nor *licet* is given a distinct place in the list. The omission of *licet* is perhaps one of the results of the fact that Professor Lane did not complete his book ; a separate section on *ne* would have given an opportunity for some very pretty work.

The advantages of this system appear in the details. In most grammars concessive clauses are treated in a group—*quamquam*, *quamlibet*, *quamvis*, *ut*, *ne*, *cum*, *licet*, *etsi* being put in one list, a heterogeneous string which pains the eye of the historical student of syntax. In contrast with this Professor Lane gives a statement of the uses of each particle separately, e. g. §§1903–1907, on *quamvis* (the first and last sections added by Professor Morgan). Section 1903 is on *quamvis* as adverb (*quamvis ridiculus est*); 1904, on *quam vis* as adverb in association with subjunctive clauses of concession (*id quam vis occultetur*, "let it be hidden as much as you will"); 1905, on the conjunction, with a division in the abundant examples between those clauses which denote action merely assumed (*quamvis sint homines . . .*, "though there may be men . . .") and those which denote real action (*illa quamvis ridicula essent, sicut erant*, "droll as this really was"); 1906, on *quamvis* with the indicative, with statistics ; 1907 is a note on *quamlibet*. The beauty of such a little history, which by its order implies and teaches a theory, is that it directs the attention of the student to the true lines of sequence and law, that it teaches him nothing which he will have to unlearn in advanced work, while at the same time it is not apparent that it sacrifices anything of pedagogical value. Indeed, it would seem that for even the youngest student there is a real gain in approaching the subject

along the line of the best tested scientific method; the mathematicians have abandoned the old Euclid, in spite of its great value for training in logic, and have introduced even into elementary text-books the methods of modern geometry.   This is that mingling of *praxis* and *wissenschaft* for which Cauer in his Grammatica Militans makes so earnest a plea.

The treatment of *ut* covers 10 pages.   As it deals with *ut* only as a subordinating conjunction, it does not include the use in wishes, in questions, etc.   These may be found by the index, but cross-references under 1935 would be convenient.   The general arrangement should be compared with the article on *ut* in Harper's Lexicon, as this method of treating syntax approaches lexicography.   Perhaps the most noticeable point in both is that what is commonly called a substantive clause and regarded, apparently, as a degeneration from clauses of purpose or result is here called a Complementary Final Clause ("to complete the sense of verbs of will or aim") or a Complementary Consecutive Clause ("to complete the sense of certain verbs and expressions, chiefly of bringing to pass, happening, and following").   Each of these statements is followed by a list of verbs which take such clauses. Pure final and consecutive clauses are thus regarded as special varieties of the complementary use.   This order, which sweeps away some fine-spun distinctions, e. g., between results which are facts and those which are not realized, can be abundantly supported by paratactic uses and is in harmony with the tendencies of speech.   In the details of the sections on *ut* there is the same deliberate care which characterizes the whole book, but here and there one may find points to question.   In 1937 the statement about *ut* with omitted correlative in old Latin is misleading and 1791, to which reference is made, is quite inadequate.   At the end of the same section an illustration of asseveration with the subjunctive would be better than the rather rare *amabunt*.   In 1939 "the protasis of a comparative period of equality" is not a good phrase.   Sections 1940–1944 on parenthetic *ut* are particularly good.   In 1946 Professor Lane has followed Brix and Lorenz and translates *sicut* "since"; I should prefer Langen and should translate "for."

The sections on *quod* are very full and good; the six lines given to *quia* remind us that the book is unfinished.   In accordance with the general plan, there is no indication of Professor Lane's view of the recent discussions of *cum*, as in the sections on prohibitions it is impossible to tell whether his silence in regard to a distinction between the present and the perfect tenses is intentional or accidental.   The treatment of explanatory *cum* might well have been fuller, as the extent of the usage warrants, and it is by no means certain that "in this use *cum* passes from the meaning of *when* to *that, in that*."   The separate treatment of *quotiens*(*cumque*) and *quo* affords suggestions not elsewhere brought together, and the discussion of *quam* apart from and as

an introduction to its compounds is very interesting. The general principle of complementary clauses (as in *ut*) is applied also to *quominus* and *quin* and does away with the necessity of trying to answer the useless question whether these clauses are final or consecutive. Section 1982 (added by Professor Morgan), "*quin* is found once with the subjunctive in a direct question," Pl. MG. 426, is in pleasing contrast to the too easy use of the same passage by Dittmar, Studien zur lat. Moduslehre, p. 95, as if it were selected from a large stock of cases.

Perhaps no part of the book will be so surprising and so disappointing to teachers of Latin as the sections on the conditional period, 2015–2122, yet no part of the book deserves more unreserved commendation. English-speaking scholars and teachers have settled down upon one or two ways of classifying conditional sentences, and these have been handed on from teacher to pupil as if they were laws of nature. Articles are written on "Fourth Form Conditions," as though all scholars not only accepted the same forms, but also numbered them in the same order. Professor Lane, however, recognizes only two kinds of conditions, Indeterminate Protases and Protases of Action Non-occurrent; indeterminate protases are subdivided into those which contain the indicative and those which contain the subjunctive, but beyond the suggestion which is implied in the subdivision there is nothing to indicate that they differ in function. Following the statement of this very simple system are some 20 pages of examples—perhaps 400 or more—arranged in groups by mode and tense. Thus there are eight groups in which the protasis contains the present indicative, the apodosis having the pres., perf., imperf., plupf., fut., fut. perf. indic., the impv. and the pres. subj.; with the perf. indic. in the protasis there are eight forms of apodosis: the pres., perf., plupf. and fut. indic., the impv., the pres., impf. and plupf. subj.; with the impf. in the protasis there are six groups, and so on through about 60 groups, including all existing combinations, the irregular as well as those which we are accustomed to think of as regular. Nor is there sufficient ground for ascribing this novel and heretical system to the fact that the grammar did not receive its author's final revision. The system most in vogue in this country was shaped many years ago by one of Professor Lane's colleagues and was transferred and applied to Latin by another colleague. The papers in which it was attacked and defended are in the Transactions of the earlier years of the Philological Association, and no American scholar, writing within the last twenty years, could have treated conditional sentences without making that controversy his starting-point. The question of a final revision within the last five years is therefore unimportant; these pages must be taken to express Professor Lane's deliberate rejection of the ordinary classification and his matured belief that a simpler system best corresponds to the facts. This attitude is important enough to justify a reviewer in running the

risk of reading into the book reasoning which may not have been in the author's mind, and I will venture to state briefly, without attempting to prove them, three points:—

1. Nearly all work upon conditional sentences has been done from the functional point of view. The only considerable work on historical principles is Blase's Geschichte des Irrealis. Of the history of other forms in Latin not enough is known to furnish a basis for historical treatment in a grammar.

2. Functional classification of conditions, like all effective classification, must be based upon essential characteristics. The essential variations of conditions have to do solely with implications of reality, of probability, of possibility, of unreality, in many and varying degrees.

3. Other characteristics—of time, of emotion, of generalization, of vividness—are accidental and no more significant in a protasis than in a *qui*-clause. But any of these characteristics may contribute to give to a condition a coloring of reality, of probability, of unreality, and this association may become permanent, as in the association of past time with unreality. Still other elements of the form and context—e. g. the person and meaning of the verb, the presence of certain adverbs—have apparently suggested similar shadings of meaning, either temporary or permanent. Of the working of these forces scarcely anything is known.

If any one of these statements is correct, Professor Lane's treatment of the conditional period is justified. For his system recognizes the inadequacy of our knowledge of the history of the Latin protasis and sets aside all classification based upon accidental characteristics, while at the same time it lays the only possible basis for sharper observation of minute varieties, in which by one means or another implications of probability and possibility are conveyed. It is to be hoped that this part of the grammar may receive the most thoughtful consideration of teachers; it ought to have a great influence in relaxing the grasp of traditional systems.

There is a peculiar and unintended meaning in the stamp of the publishers upon the title-page, representing the passing of the torch from hand to hand, for the book passed unfinished from the hand of the master to the hand of the pupil. Professor Morgan has fulfilled the difficult duty of preparing the grammar for publication with something higher than self-effacement; he has preserved in the necessary re-arrangements and additions the very tone and temper of Professor Lane's work. Doubtless Professor Morgan would desire that all the credit should go to the author, but in truth no inconsiderable share must be ascribed to the editor. And Harvard University may place the book in the list of classical publications of which she may well be proud.

E. P. MORRIS.

A Simple Grammar of English Now in Use. By JOHN EARLE,
M. A., Rawlinsonian Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the Uni-
versity of Oxford. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons; Lon-
don, Smith, Elder & Co., 1898.

Professor Earle informs us (Preface, p. 1) that his book is "not
of Philology, but of Grammar," and that its aim is "not scientific,
but educational." The period treated "begins with the first
generation of the sixteenth century, and covers the space of four
hundred years," including in *present* English "the language of
the English Bible and of Shakspere"; but as some forms and
locutions of the early sixteenth century are omitted, *present*
English may be said to date from Shakspere.

The Parts of Speech are first treated; then the Syntax, divided
into 'Plain Syntax' and 'Graphic Syntax,' which is elementary
rhetoric; Prosody follows, and an Appendix on Punctuation,
together with Exercises in Parsing and Analysis. Professor Earle
is right to include prosody, for a knowledge of it, even if elemen-
tary, aids in the appreciation of poetry, and it is too often neglected
in treatises on grammar intended for the use of schools. Pro-
fessor Earle says that "our earliest verse was without Metre, as it
was without Rhyme," but this depends upon what we mean by
metre, and it is scarcely correct to say that "Alliteration and
Caesura may be said to constitute the Technique of our older
poetry." These were essential features, but not the whole of it.

While not so well suited for elementary instruction. the book
will be found very serviceable for more advanced pupils, and will
serve to instil correct notions of grammar, and to teach pupils
what they will not have to unlearn. Some points, as the nature
of the umlaut plurals, *feet*, *teeth*, etc., and of such plurals as *deer*,
sheep, etc., might have been explained, for pupils will get no
better idea of these apparent anomalies in English than from an
ordinary English Grammar.

The statement with respect to the genitive case of nouns
ending in -*s* is not strictly in accordance with present usage, for,
along with such forms as 'Cassius' dagger' we find 'Cassius's
dagger.' Professor Earle rightly retains the dative case, and
illustrates its use throughout the book. An expansion of his
remarks on 'go a-fishing' and like phrases would be desirable,
for much ignorance is prevalent as to these survivals of older
English idioms.

He uses the term 'flat' for 'simple' infinitive, and has introduced
some other unfamiliar terms; 'flexional' infinitive may answer
for the 'gerundial' infinitive, but the latter term is more common.
His remarks on such forms as 'foremost,' etc., will scarcely be
understood without further explanation. Professor Earle says
'the first two,' and we agree with him, *contra* some grammarians.

A fuller explanation of the terms 'strong' and 'weak' verbs
would be desirable, and in the list of strong verbs some forms are

omitted that are in current use, as weak, for older strong forms, *chided, cleaved, heaved*; also strong preterite *ĕat* (*et*), as well as *ate*, and pp. *hewed*, as well as *hewn*. So some strong forms prevalent in the period treated are omitted, as pp. *crown, sitten*, preterite *slang, stang*, etc.; and older weak forms, as *shined* for *shone*.

The obsolete *yode* (went) was common in the sixteenth century, and might have been included; *rid, ris* should have been printed in thick type as obsolete, and so pp. *rose, arose*; pret. *awoke*, and pp. *abode* are in good current use and might have been so noted. Under *wend* we miss *wended, went* being alone given. But it is scarcely worth while to note a few omissions of this sort, although they could be added to.

As most grammarians, Professor Earle is a stickler for the modern distinction between *shall* and *will*—which so many regard as a shibboleth of "good English"—saying, "When *will* is put in the place of *shall*, it is a Kelticism." We must then exclude Shakspere and the Bible from "good English" and resign them to the Kelts, for they are arch offenders in this respect. "Oh! but they were written three hundred years ago," which is true, but they are specimens of the best English then known, and this proves that the present distinction is a late one. Professor Earle violates his own rules, saying (p. 111): "There is, moreover, a third aspect, namely, the Interrogative; but we will first treat of Affirmative and Negative."

Wert (p. 48) is admitted only as subjunctive, but it is found as indicative.

'Self-verbs' (p. 51) is another original term; it means 'presentive' or 'notional,' and not auxiliary. The terms 'preterite definite' and 'preterite indefinite' (p. 46) are used in a sense exactly contrary to their usual grammatical use, for we usually understand by the former the preterite with *have*, and by the latter the aorist, not as in French.

Professor Earle says (p. 63) that, wherever *its* is found in Shakspere, "it is generally due to some later editor"; but there are *ten* examples in the First Folio, nine of them spelt *it's* and one *its*, and Heming and Condell were hardly responsible for these forms. On p. 65, last word, 'Second' is a misprint for 'First.' The formation of the plurals of the demonstrative pronouns is omitted. A few words would have explained to beginners why *these* is used as the plural of *this*, and *those* of *that*.

The originally adjective use of *which* is unnoticed. Professor Earle says (p. 70): "In regard to 'Our Father which,' the Americans have taken a new departure, and they elect to say 'Our Father who'"; but they are not peculiar in this respect.

'Evolute' for subordinate (p. 80) is another of Professor Earle's unusual terms.

In the Syntax 'The Split Infinitive' (p. 96) scarcely meets with the condemnation that it deserves. Grammarians should

not hesitate to condemn this usage. The interposition of a plural noun can not justify the concord of a plural verb with a singular subject, even if Dean Farrar is the offender. "Homer nods" in grammar as well as elsewhere.

The examples of intransitive verbs made transitive (p. 116) might have been explained on the principles of the cognate accusative and of the causative verb. The verbal noun (Earle's 'flexional infinitive,' p. 118) is equally as common in such phrases as 'He will give up caring,' etc., as the simple (Earle's 'flat') infinitive with or without the preposition *to*.

Earle supports 'The man I had written to,' as against the purist grammarians, 'The man to whom I had written.' *The Academy* rightly regards the idiom as "a token of the progressive restitution of English."

Professor Earle's terms 'co-ordinata' and 'evoluta' are no gain over 'compound' and 'complex' sentences.

He explains as 'tense-attraction' such sentences as "But you should have endeavoured to have shown" (Pilgrim's Progress). It is an older construction, found in Shakspere, but now condemned by the best writers.

We should scarcely say now, with Richardson, 'You have a young lady lodges here.' While the omission of the *object* relative is common enough, that of the *subject* relative is disallowed. Professor Earle mentions "the Double or Cumulate Genitive" (p. 146), but gives no explanation. After Dean Alford, he defends 'It is me' as "idiomatic English," but says: "it is not fully recognized as literary English." Lack of space forbids further notice of this useful volume.

J. M. G.

———

Traité de métrique grecque par P. MASQUERAY. Paris, Librairie
    C. Klincksieck, 1899.

The 'Nouvelle collection à l'usage des classes' issued by the publishing-house of C. Klincksieck, of Paris, and comprising among other useful books F. Plessis' 'Traité de métrique grecque et latine' (1889), has now been enriched by a similar little work, which, however, is devoted to Greek metres exclusively. The title of the book is 'Traité de métrique grecque,' and its author is P. Masqueray, well known by his larger work entitled 'Théorie des formes lyriques de la tragédie grecque.' The distinguishing feature of Masqueray's new work is his peculiar treatment of Glyconic and kindred verse. Scholars of this country have, for more than a generation, been following Rossbach and Westphal or J. H. H. Schmidt for these metres, and now the author of the work under discussion, who, in the preface, acknowledges the great services rendered to the cause of Greek Rhythmic and Metric by such men as Boeckh, Rossbach and Westphal, J. H. H.

Schmidt, Christ, Gleditsch, and others, bids us part company
with these men and go back to Hephaestion and Aristides Quin-
tilianus.   Such scansions as —◡◡⸜|◡—◡⸜ (μαλθακὸν ὀμμάτων
βέλος), ◡——◡|◡—◡⸜ (δίπαις τοί σ' ἐπιτύμβιος), ◡—◡⸜|—◡◡⸜
('Ερως ἀνίκατε μάχαν) (p. 260), and —◡—◡|◡—◡⸜ (κάπρος ἡνίχ' ὁ
μαινόλης) (p. 262), may pass muster provided liberal use is made
of syncopation, but, as they stand, they are practically worthless.
By the use of syncopation these lines may be reduced to Iambic
dimeters, as follows:

$$\widetilde{◡◡}◡\ ◡⸜|◡—◡⸜$$
$$◡—\ \widetilde{◡◡}◡|◡—◡⸜$$
$$◡—\ ◡—|\widetilde{◡◡}◡\ ◡⸜$$
$$\widetilde{◡◡}◡\ \widetilde{◡◡}◡|◡—◡⸜.$$

This scansion would be quite difficult of execution for the
beginner, and the attempt even on the part of an expert would
be characterized by a tendency to revert to the ordinary scansion:

$$\widetilde{◡◡}|—◡|—◡|—\wedge$$
$$◡|\llcorner|\widetilde{◡◡}|—◡|—\wedge$$
$$◡|—◡|\llcorner|\widetilde{◡◡}|—\wedge$$
$$—◡|\widetilde{◡◡}|—◡|—\wedge.$$

Now, when even Masqueray is compelled with Hephaestion to
admit the existence of logaoedic dactyls—that is, dactyls of the
same time-value as the trochee—and when the modern scansion
agrees strictly with the laws of Greek rhythm as enunciated by
the writer of this notice in the Johns Hopkins University Circulars
for 1883–84, p. 125, why not follow this more simple and more
direct mode of scansion?   But whatever may be said in favor of
Masqueray's scansion of the verses above cited, nothing favorable
can be said of such scansions as ———◡|◡—◡⸜ (βουλοίμην κέρας
οὔτ' ἔτη) (p. 267), instead of the more rational —>| $\widetilde{◡◡}$|—◡|—∧,
or of ———◡|◡∟.⸜ (ἄνδρες πρόσσχετε τὸν νοῦν) (p. 263) for
—>| $\widetilde{◡◡}$|∟|—∧.   And why should students adopt such a
complex and difficult scansion of the Sapphic strophe as

$$—◡——|—◡◡⸜|◡∟.\acute{6}$$
$$—◡——|—◡◡⸜|◡∟.\acute{6}$$
$$—◡——|—◡◡⸜|◡∟.⸜|—◡◡⸞|.—\underset{\wedge}{\llcorner}$$

(p. 279), instead of

$$—◡|—\breve{⸜}|\widetilde{◡◡}|—◡|—\breve{⸜}$$
$$—◡|—\breve{⸜}|\widetilde{◡◡}|—◡|—\breve{⸜}$$
$$—◡|—\breve{⸜}|\widetilde{◡◡}|—◡|—\breve{⸜}$$
$$\widetilde{◡◡}|—\breve{⸜},$$

when the latter is so simple, so practical, and there is no theo-
retical consideration against it?   Why discard the easy and
unobjectionable modern scansion of the Alcaic strophe,

$$\check{\;}|-\cup|-\check{\;}|\,\smile\!\cup|-\cup|-\wedge$$
$$\check{\;}|-\cup|-\check{\;}|\,\smile\!\cup|-\cup|-\wedge$$
$$\check{\;}|-\cup|-\check{\;}|-\cup|-\check{\;}$$
$$\smile\!\cup|\,\smile\!\cup|-\cup|-\check{\;},$$

in favor of such strange and partly unintelligible schemes as

$$\cup-\cup\angle|\cup-\cup\cup|.\llcorner\cup\check{\;}$$
$$\cup-\cup\angle|--\cup\cup|.\llcorner\cup\angle$$
$$\cup-\cup\angle|--\cup\angle|--\cup\cup|-\cup\cup\angle|\cup\llcorner.\angle$$

or

$$--\cup\angle|--\cup\cup|.\llcorner\cup\check{\;}$$
$$--\cup\angle|\cup-\cup\cup|.\llcorner\cup\angle$$
$$--\cup\angle|\cup-\cup\angle|--\cup\cup|-\cup\cup\angle|\cup\llcorner.\angle$$

(p. 283)? And similar questions might be asked in the case of the Phalaecean and Asclepiadean verses, for which we are asked to accept the following scansions :

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}-\cup\\\cup-\\--\end{array}\right\}-\cup|\cup-\cup\angle|\cup\llcorner.\angle \text{ (p. 292),}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}-\cup\\\cup-\end{array}\right\}-\cup|\cup--\cup|\cup-\cup\angle \text{ (ibid.), and}$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l}-\cup\\--\\\cup-\end{array}\right\}-\cup|\cup--\cup|\cup--\cup|\cup-\cup\check{\;} \text{ (p. 293).}$$

The question of anacrustic scansion, in behalf of which some very excellent reasons may be adduced, is rudely dismissed with these words (p. 152): "*Je rejette absolument cette théorie.*" There are one or two other points that would seem to merit discussion, but lack of space forbids. In conclusion it is but fair to state that aside from the above indications of the author's lack of sympathy with more modern ideas of rhythm, and apart from a few typographical errors that will be found here and there throughout the book, the work, as a whole, is an admirable work and ought to prove a useful manual to beginners.

C. W. E. MILLER.

REPORTS.

Janvier.

A. Jeanroy. Études sur le cycle de Guillaume au court nez.—
II. Les *Enfances Guillaume*, le *Charroi de Nîmes*, la *Prise
d'Orange*; rapport de ces poèmes entre eux et avec la *Vita
Willelmi.* 33 pages. The portion of the cycle of Guillaume
here treated is apparently based on a legend derived, toward the
end of the 11th century, from South France, by a northern
jongleur who had made the pilgrimage to Saint-Gilles. This
legend is probably based on dim recollections of the Saracen
invasions of the 8th century, in which Guillaume de Toulouse
was evidently substituted for historic personages of a period
earlier than his own. By the aid of foreign redactions we make
out traces of a *Prise d'Orange* less complicated and more
dramatic than the extant version; in scattered allusions and in
the statements of the *Vita Willelmi* we catch glimpses of a
'Siège d'Orange' and of a 'Prise de Tortose.' Into this epic
current was introduced, directly from the *Vita*, the *Moniage
Guillaume*, an enrichment of the primitive legend scarcely earlier
than the middle of the 12th century.

P. Rajna. Contributi allo studio dell' epopea e del romanzo
medievale.—IX. Altre orme antiche dell' epopea carolingia in
Italia. 40 pages. The author discusses, with wealth of erudition,
the significance of a number of such passages as

> Francorum prosa sunt edita bella sonora
> Italiaeque stilus quod pingit proelia scimus.

A. Morel-Fatio. Version napolitaine d'un texte catalan du
Secretum secretorum.

Mélanges. P. Meyer. Éloge d'un épervier (fragment d'un
poème inconnu).—Le fableau du *Héron* ou La *Fille mal gardée*.
"C'est un fableau qui, par le sujet, est identique au fableau de la
Grue ... mais la rédaction est absolument dissemblable ... Il
est permis de se demander si l'un des deux poèmes est une imita-
tion ou, si l'on veut, un remaniement de l'autre. Je suis porté à
croire qu'il n'en est rien et que les deux fableaux sont la mise en
œuvre d'un conte qui faisait partie de la littérature orale de
l'époque ... Il existe plusieurs cas analogues. Ainsi la *Bour-
geoise d'Orléans* et le fableau du chevalier, de la dame et du clerc

.. n'ont d'autre rapport que la communauté d'origine: ils ne dérivent pas l'un de l'autre, mais chacun d'eux nous offre une rédaction indépendante et très personnelle d'un conte qui circulait oralement et qui, par conséquent, devait avoir une forme assez flottante."—Couplets sur le mariage. "Le sujet de ces couplets est un peu celui de la célèbre pièce *de conjuge non ducenda* [cf. the advice of Mr. Punch]; seulement la conclusion est toute différente, puisque l'auteur français, après avoir pesé le pour et le contre, se décide finalement à se marier." M. Meyer has difficulty in understanding the author's alleged motive for taking a wife:

> Ke il ne me estoce querre ors
> Chaaunt par fossez cum uns orbs.

Of the first of the above verses he remarks: "Je ne comprends pas *ors*. Est-ce 'hors'?" *Ors* is obviously *ursus*: 'So that I need not seek a bear [to lead me, and keep me from] falling into ditches like a blind man."—Restitution d'une chanson de Peire Guillem de Luserne.—Les Jours d'emprunt d'après Alexandre Neckam. Postscript to Romania, XVIII 107.—Ov. Densusianu. Roumain *spalare* 'laver.' Not = *ex-per-lavare*, as given by Körting, but **expellare* (from *pellem*).

Comptes rendus. Mélanges de philologie romane dédiés à Carl Wahlund (G. Paris). 8 pages, giving a brief critical analysis of each of the 31 articles contained in the work. "On voit quel est l'intérêt solide et varié de ce volume, tout à fait digne de celui à qui il a été offert."—Études d'histoire du moyen âge dediées à Gabriel Monod (G. Paris). "Contient 31 mémoires. Tous font honneur au savoir et à la méthode des disciples qui les ont offerts en hommage au maître envers lequel ils se sentent si justement reconnaissants."—Paul Gehrt. Zwei altfranzösische Bruchstücke des Floovant (G. Paris). "Les fragments de Fribourg offrent un réel intérêt ... M. Gehrt a très bien mis cet intérêt en lumière." —Pio Rajna. Il trattato *De vulgari eloquentia* (Paget Toynbee). 10 pages, in English. " It is a remarkable proof of the enduring interest in everything relating to Dante, that Prof. Rajna should have been content to expend the labour of years, represented here by more than four hundred closely printed pages, upon one of the least known, and the shortest (excepting always the highly suspicious *Quaestio de aqua et terra*), of the great Florentine's writings ... Let us hope that the present publication is but an earnest of what we have to expect from Dante's 'nobil patria.'"— Emilio Cotarelo y Mori. Don Enrique de Villena. Su vida y obras (A. Morel-Fatio). 6 pages. "Enrique de Villena est, après le marquis de Santillane, le représentant le plus éminent de cette aristocratie espagnole lettrée du XVᵉ siècle qui essaya de répandre en Espagne le goût de la littérature antique et d'initier la nation à quelques-unes des conquêtes de l'humanisme italien ... Cette monographie ... mérite en somme qu'on la recommande et la loue."—D. Ciàmpoli. I codici francesi della R.

Biblioteca nazionale de S. Marco in Venezia descritti e illustrati
(P. Meyer). "Comment peut-on avoir confié le soin de rédiger
ce catalogue à une personne aussi mal préparée?"—Recueil
d'anciens inventaires imprimés sous les auspices du comité des
travaux historiques. Tome I (P. Meyer).—Eugène Rolland.
Flore populaire ou Histoire naturelle des plantes dans leurs
rapports avec la linguistique et le folk-lore. Tome I (André
Beaunier). M. Rolland, who is the author of the highly valued
Faune populaire, completed, in six volumes, in 1883, has begun
the publication of a *Flore populaire*, on a similar plan and scale.
"La science et la superstition, la médecine et les remèdes de
bonnes femmes n'étaient pas choses bien distinctes au moyen âge.
Aussi nul vocabulaire n'est-il peut-être aussi complexe que celui
de la flore par ses origines et par son développement. L'ouvrage
de M. Rolland... permettra d'étudier de très près l'obscure
question des rapports des savants et du peuple au moyen âge, et
amènera, si je ne me trompe, à cette conclusion, que ces deux
sociétés étaient beaucoup moins étrangères l'une à l'autre, beau-
coup plus mêlées l'une à l'autre qu'on ne se le figure générale-
ment."

Périodiques. In Zeitschrift f. rom. Phil. XX 519, Neumann,
Zu den vulgärlateinisch-romanischen Accentgesetzen, discusses
the case of Latin proparoxytones in which the penult was followed
by mute+liquid (*r*), and attributes the Romance shifting of the
accent (*colóbra, palpêtra, intégrum*) to a *svarabhakti*, i. e. the
unconscious insertion of a vowel between mute and *r* (*colóbera,
palpêlera, intégero*). This explanation is not altogether new (cf.
Lindsay, The Latin Language, p. 130), but M. Gaston Paris finds
it improbable. "Rien n'est moins invraisemblable qu'un *svara-
bhakti* (phénomène d'ailleurs très réel et très digne d'étude) dans
des mots comme ceux dont il s'agit. Il était déjà difficile au
peuple de maintenir l'accent sur l'antépénultième quand elle était
suivie d'un tel nombre de phonèmes (*cólobra, integro*), et bien
loin d'aloudir encore ce poids déjà trop fort, il s'en est débarrassé
en portant l'accent sur la pénultième (exactement comme le
provençal a fait pour *tremóla, lagrêma*, etc.)."

Chronique. "La science de la littérature comparée a fait une
grande perte par la mort, à l'age de 71 ans, de Francis J. Child
... Tous ceux qui s'intéressent à cette science connaissent l'ad-
mirable recueil des *English and Scottish Popular Ballads* ...
publication qui est pour la science d'une valeur et d'une utilité
si exceptionnelles."—Un autre savant Américain, M. Austin
Stickney, l'éditeur du poème des quatre vertus cardinales, de
Daude de Prades, est décédé à Paris. ... Sa perte sera vivement
ressentie de tous ceux qui l'ont connu."

Livres annoncés sommairement. 20 titles. G. Keidel. A
Manual of Aesopic Fable Literature. A first book of reference
for the period ending A. D. 1500. First fascicule. "Il est loin

de nous offrir un véritable manuel de la littérature des fables ésopiques."—F. Beck.　Dantes *Vita Nova.*　Kritischer Text, unter Benutzung von 35 bekannten Handschriften.　"Paraît, pour le texte, vraiment définitive ... Un glossaire complet, aussi précieux comme source lexicographique que comme répertoire pour les citations ... termine ce volume."—H. Breymann.　Die phonetische Literatur von 1876–1895.　Eine bibliographisch-kritische Uebersicht.　"Rendra les plus grands services."

Avril.

Ph. Lauer.　Louis IV d'Outremer et le fragment d'*Isembart et Gormont.*　13 pages.　The legend of the battle of King Louis against Isembard and Gormond is to be regarded as resulting from a traditional confusion of the victory of Louis III at San-court with that of Louis IV over Turmod and Setric.　The article is a clearly expressed and interesting contribution to our knowledge of the Isembart fragment.

A. Jeanroy.　Études sur le cycle de Guillaume au court nez.—III. Notes sur la légende de Vivien.　33 pages.　"Quelle est donc cette légende qui, surgissant brusquement, a pris soudain un développement capable de troubler le courant d'une tradition aussi puissante, aussi universellement connue que celle de Guillaume?　D'où peut provenir ce personnage, qui a eu la singulière fortune, non seulement de rejeter dans l'ombre des figures d'un relief aussi accusé que celle de Thibaut l'antique adversaire de Guillaume, mais encore d'amener avec lui à la lumière tout un groupe de héros jusque là inconnus?　Cette question n'est pas, semble-t-il, près d'être résolue ... Ce ne sont donc point des solutions que je prétends apporter ici."

J. Ulrich.　Deux traductions en haut engadinois du XVI*e* siècle.　17 pages.　Latin text with Engadine translation and glossary.

P. Meyer.　Traités en vers provençaux sur l'astrologie et la géomancie.　50 pages, with facsimile plate.　"Ce sont deux manuels, l'un d'astrologie, l'autre de géomancie, sciences connexes ... 'Je sais [says the author of the first of these treatises] me servir de l'astrolabe, du fil à plomb, du cadran.　Je dis aux hommes, selon 28 leçons, toutes leurs conditions.　Je sais, au moyen de la sphère, dire en quel signe un homme est né.　Je connais les expériences véridiques de la nécromancie et la trans-mutation des éléments, mais de tout ce savoir je fais peu de cas par comparaison à l'autre [c'est à dire, l'astrologie et la géomancie].'"

Mélanges.　P. Meyer et G. Paris.　Fragment du *Vallet a la cotte mal talliee.*　"Intéressant parce qu'il appartient à un roman 'biographique' en vers, dont l'existence était assurée, mais dont on n'avait jusqu'à présent retrouvé aucun vestige sous la forme

23

poétique."—C. Salvioni. *Tenser.* Supports G. Paris in deriving the word from *tensum* 'covering, defense,' as opposed to etymologies recently offered by Tobler and Suchier.—Ant. Thomas. Prov. *mnh* = lat. *mj, mbj.* Maintains that the much-disputed form *fremna* (= Lat. *fimbria*), of the *Boèce* poem, stands for *fremnha.*

Comptes rendus. G. Körting. Neugriechisch und Romanisch, ein Beitrag zur Sprachvergleichung (Ov. Densusianu). 6 pages. "Le but du travail de M. K. est de chercher jusqu'à quel point le néo-grec et les langues romanes se sont éloignés de l'ancien grec, d'un côté, et du latin, de l'autre ... La méthode que l'auteur a suivie prête beaucoup à la critique. Comme point de comparaison avec les langues romanes, M. K. prend cette langue intermédiaire entre les dialectes et la langue écrite, cette 'Durchschnittvolkssprache,' comme M. Thumb l'appelle, que les Grecs désignent par le nom de κοινή. D'après le titre et d'après quelques mots de l'auteur ... nous pensions que M. K. aurait mis les dialectes à contribution dans une assez large mesure. Il n'en est rien."—William Henry Schofield. Studies on the *Libeaus Desconus* (Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature) (Em. Philipot). 15 pages. "Étude d'ensemble sur le cycle du *Bel Inconnu* ... Voici d'abord un résultat désormais acquis après la thèse de M. Schofield: le *Bel Inconnu* anglais est indépendant du *Bel Inconnu* français. Jamais l'opinion témérairement développée par M. Kaluza n'avait été réfutée avec un tel luxe de bonnes preuves ... On y souhaiterait une composition moins décousue et une logique plus pénétrante."—Ramon Menéndez Pidal. La legenda de los Infantes de Lara (A. Morel-Fatio). 15 pages. "Bref, la geste des Sept Infants et l'héroïque sauvagerie dont elle est impregnée symbolisent vraiment la Castille et le Castillan mieux peut-être que celle du Cid. ... C'est à l'étude des origines et du développement de l'antique *ystoria* que M. Menéndez Pidal a consacré son livre ... le plus important, ou mieux, le seul important qu'on ait publié depuis la *Poesia heroico-popular castellana* de Milá y Fontanals ... Toutes les parties de cette étude sont également soignées ... S'il est lu, s'il est compris, ce livre peut provoquer en Espagne une véritable renaissance des études philologiques et historiques. Les jeunes gens surtout y apprendront que rien, pas même les dons les plus brillants, ne remplacent le travail méthodique, la conscience dans les recherches, le souci constant de l'exactitude."—Currado Ricci. La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri, illustrata nei luoghi e nelle persone (Paget Toynbee). "The illustrations, which, when complete, will number more than four hundred, including thirty heliotype full-page plates, are taken, in the case of the portraits, from frescoes and sculptures, while those of places and buildings are, for the most part, zincotype reproductions of photographs taken on the spot."—Amabile di Continentia, romanzo morale del secolo XV, a cura di Augusto Cesari (G. Paris). "Beaucoup d'inutilités ... et peu de choses personnelles."

Périodiques. M. Paget Toynbee gives a valuable report (10 pages, in English) on the first three annual volumes of the Giornale Dantesco (1894–96). "Altogether these volumes constitute a veritable storehouse of information on all subjects connected with Dante."

Chronique.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 27 titles. M. Scherillo. *Pape Satan.* "L'explication de ce casse-tête célèbre proposée par M. Scherillo . . . consiste à prendre *satan* non pour un synonyme de Lucifer, mais au sens d' 'ennemi,' auquel sens Pluton l'appliquerait à Dante; *pape* serait l'exclamation bien connue *papae*; *aleppe* le nom hébreu de l'*a, aleph,* au sens, qui lui a été donné, d'exclamation de douleur. Cette explication est assurément plus acceptable que beaucoup d'autres." Had been independently given twice before, and is pretty certainly correct.—J. G. Stürzinger. *Le Pelerinage de l'ame* de Guillaume de Deguilleville. Printed for the Roxburghe Club. "Il est impossible d'apporter à une publication aussi longue et . . . souvent aussi fastidieuse, des soins plus attentifs et plus intelligents que ne l'a fait M. Stürzinger."

Juillet.

G. Paris. Le Roman de Richard Cœur de Lion. 40 pages. "Le roman de *Richard Coerdelyon* est un des plus intéressants monuments de la poésie anglaise du moyen âge, et il n'a pas été jusqu'à présent, si je ne me trompe, apprecié à sa valeur. Il soulève encore bien des questions en dehors de celles qui ont été abordées ici. Il serait fort désirable qu'on en publiât, d'après l'étude de tous les manuscrits, une édition critique."

Arthur Piaget. *Le Livre Messire Geoffroi de Charny.* 17 pages. Froissart informs us that at the battle of Poitiers messire Geoffroi de Charny fought with great valor by the side of King John. "Et estoit toute la presse et la huée sur lui, pour tant qu'il portoit la souveraine baniere du roy . . . Et fu occis messires Joffrois de Chargni, la baniere de France entre ses mains." The present article, besides offering a sketch of his life, gives an account of his works, viz. two in prose, *Demandes pour la joute, les tournois et la guerre,* and *Livre de Chevalerie,* and one in verse, *Le Livre Charny,* of which last the most interesting portions are here published in extract.

Antoine Thomas. Étymologies françaises et provençales. 40 pages. Some 40 new etymologies, with discussions. A few of the more important are: Fr. *biais* (Eng. *bias*), not from *bifacem,* but from **biasius* (*bis* and *asa,* for *ansa*); Fr. *bâcler* 'to bar,' from **bacculare,* not **baculare*; Fr. *bouillie* 'pap,' not fem. past participle of *bouillir*; "la bouillie me paraît devoir son nom au sédiment—si apprécié des enfants—qui reste au fond de la casserole où on la prépare, aux grumeaux qui s'y forment si

souvent. Nous trouvons en latin *bolarium* . . . grumeau."⸱ The stem of this word (Greek βῶλος) + the Romance suffix *-éa* has given, according to Prof. T., Prov. *boulié*, whence Fr. *bouillie*. This explanation seems to call for the addendum: strongly influenced and colored by the participle *bouilli* (cf. masc. *bouilli* 'boiled meat'); O.Fr. *cit* (city), from **civitem*, for *civitatem* (best discussion of this word that has yet appeared); Fr. *gourgouran* 'étoffe travaillée en gros-de-Tours.' "Nous avons donné aux Anglais notre *gros-grain* (comme aux Espagnols notre *gros de Tours* [written *grodetur*]), et ils nous l'ont rendu avec usure, non seulement sous la forme de *gourgouran* [Eng. *grogram*], qui n'a qu'une notoriété bien restreinte, mais sous la forme de *grog*, que tout le monde connaît." [Cf. Eng. *riding-coat*, borrowed into Fr. as *redingote*, under which form it was re-borrowed into English.]

Paget Toynbee. Dante's Seven Examples of Munificence in the Convivio (IV ii). Dante asks:

Chi non ha ancora nel cuore Alessandro, per li suoi reali beneficii? Chi non ha ancora il buon re di Castilla, o il Saladino, o il buono marchese di Monferrato, o il buono conte di Tolosa, o Beltramo dal Bornio, o Galasso da Montefeltro, quando delle loro messioni si fa menzione.

"As regards . . . the King of Castile, the Marquis of Montferrat, and the Count of Toulouse, no serious attempt . . . has been made to identify them." Interesting identifications.

Comptes rendus. Ed. Schwan. Grammatik des Altfranzösischen, 3te Auflage neu bearbeitet von Dr. Dietrich Behrens. Teil I. Die Lautlehre (Mario Roques). "Toutes les théories, tous les faits ont été revus de très près et d'après les plus récents travaux."—F. Hansen. Sobre la formacion del imperfecto de la 2ᵈᵃ i 3ʳᵃ conj. castellana en las poesias de G. de Berceo [and various other monographs] (E. Porębowicz). "La méthode . . . n'est ni assez sûre ni assez féconde . . . Ne laisse pas de présenter une grande utilité à cause des matériaux."—H. Ehrismann. Le Sermon des plaies (G. Paris). "Ne manque pas d'intérêt."—P. J. Mather. King Pontus and the Fair Sidoine [Publications of the Mod. Lang. Assoc.] (G. Paris). "L'introduction de M. Mather contient, en dehors de l'étude du roman anglais et de son original français, plusieurs renseignements utiles pour l'histoire de cet ouvrage."—L. de Santi et A. Vidal. Deux livres de raison [account-books] (1517–1550) (P. Meyer). "Ces deux livres de raison sont en langue vulgaire: outre l'intérêt linguistique ils se recommandent—comme au reste presque tous les ouvrages de ce genre qui ont été publiés en ces dernières années—par l'abondance des renseignements qu'ils fournissent sur la vie privée et sur les conditions économiques du temps où ils ont été composés."

Périodiques.—Chronique.—Livres annoncés sommairement. 4 titles.

Octobre.

F. Lot. Notes sur le *Moniage Guillaume.*—I. *Tombe Issoire* ou *Tombe Isoré?*—II. L'épisode des ronces.

G. Huet. La rédaction néerlandaise de *Maugis d'Aigremont*, suivi de fragments inédits. 22 pages. "En somme, événements et personnages, le *Maugis* néerlandais est construit, pour l'essentiel, avec les mêmes matériaux que le *Maugis* français, mais à ces matériaux on en a ajouté d'autres, on en a laissés d'autres de côté, on a groupé le tout autrement, et on a obtenu un ensemble très différent du poème français."

A. Jeanroy. Les chansons de Philippe de Beaumanoir. 20 pages. Eleven love-songs, all but one of which may be attributed, with considerable or complete certainty, to Philippe de Beaumanoir.

Paget Toynbee. Dante's Obligations to the *Magnae Derivationes* of Uguccione da Pisa. 18 pages. Hugutio Pisanus was professor of ecclesiastical jurisprudence at Bologna about 1178, and Bishop of Ferrara from 1190–1210. His *Magnae Derivationes* has never been printed. By copious extracts and interesting comparisons Mr. Toynbee here sets forth Dante's indebtedness to this work.

C. Nigra. Note etimologiche e lessicali. Eight or ten ingeniously presented etymologies, forming an instructive chapter in the history of metathesis. Thus, Ital. *biondo*, Fr., Prov. *blond*, are derived from *ablundus*, for *albundus* (from *albus*; cf. *rubic-undus*). The form *ablunda* occurs in Papias, meaning 'straw,' and Caseneuve derives from it *blond*, "la couleur de la paille et des moissons."

Mélanges. F. Lot. *Le Charroi de Nîmes.* "La prise de Nîmes n'est pas de pure invention. Charles Martel s'empara de cette ville en 738 et la détruisit. Cette expédition est racontée par la *Continuation de Fredégaire* ... C'est là sans doute que l'auteur du Charroi, ou l'un de ses prédécesseurs, a puisé la connaissance de la prise de Nîmes sur les Sarrazins."—F. Lot. Bègues. Suggestions as to the identity of this personage in the poem of *Garin le Lorrain.*

Comptes rendus. F. W. Bourdillon. Tote listoire de France (G. Paris). "M. Bourdillon est un amateur anglais, très instruit, d'origine française, et qui a gardé un souvenir affectueux à la patrie de ses ancêtres ... On voit que si j'ai pu appeler M. Bourdillon un amateur, sa publication n'est nullement ce qu'on nomme un travail d'amateur."—P. Arfert. Das Motiv der unterschobenen Braut in der internationalen Erzählungslitteratur (G. Paris). "La partie pour nous la plus intéressante de cette dissertation—qui en elle-même est intéressante dans toutes ses parties ...—est l'Appendice consacré à la légende de Berte ... Je crois

en tout cas avec lui que la substitution remise à la nuit de noces est une altération due à l'influence d'un autre conte . . . mais ce conte est, à mon avis, celui de la *Reine qui tua son sénéchal* bien plutôt que celui de Brangien."—P. Rajna.   Il trattato *De Vulgari Eloquentia* di Dante Alighieri (Paget Toynbee).   Reprint of the critical text of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* noticed above, with further emendations and valuable indices.—G. Mazzatinti.   La Biblioteca dei re d'Aragona in Napoli (P. Meyer).   The formation of this celebrated library, of which Alphonsus the Magnanimous (1435–1458) was the founder, is of great interest in the history of Humanism and of the arts.   The library did not remain long intact.   Charles VIII transferred to Blois a large number of its volumes, which thus became the nucleus of the "bibliothèque du roi," afterwards the National Library of France.

Périodiques.   Report on the volumes for 1892–97 of the Literaturblatt für germ. u. rom. Philologie.

Chronique.   D. Mariano Aguiló y Fuster died at Barcelona, June 6, 1897.   "Aguiló connaissait mieux que qui que ce fût la langue et la littérature catalane."—Léon Gautier died August 25, 1897, aged 65 years.   He was a graduate and professor of the École des Chartes, and at the time of his death "chef de la section historique des Archives nationales."   His principal works were the *Œuvres poétiques d'Adam de Saint-Victor*, numerous editions of the *Chanson de Roland, Les Épopées françaises* (in 4 vols.), a popular work on *La Chevalerie au moyen âge, L'Histoire de la poésie liturgique au moyen âge*, and a *Bibliographie des chansons de geste*.   "Gautier n'était pas philologue . . . Il gardera le mérite d'avoir été l'un des hommes qui ait le plus contribué à répandre dans le public instruit et lisant la connaissance de la partie la plus intéressante et peut-être la plus originale de la vieille littérature française."—Frédéric Godefroy died September 30, 1897, aged 71 years.   His life-work was the (almost completed) *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, planned to occupy ten quarto volumes, and published under the auspices of the French Government.   "N'ayant de l'ancien français qu'une connaissance purement empirique, il pouvait bien corriger les fautes de détail qu'on lui signalait, mais il ne profitait guère des critiques générales qu'on lui adressait."—The death of Don Pascual de Gayangos, well known for his works on the history and the literature of Spain, occurred at London, October 4, 1897.   After editing several of the volumes in Rivadeneyra's Biblioteca de autores españoles, Gayangos translated into Spanish Ticknor's History of Spanish Literature.   Between the years 1875 and 1893 he published the Catalogue of Spanish Manuscripts in the Library of the British Museum.—"Il regne à Columbia, dans les études romanes, une activité déjà remarquable, et qui ne peut qu'aller en s'accroissant."

Livres annoncés sommairement.   57 titles.   Hugo A. Rennert. *La Isla Bárbara* and *La Guardia cuidadosa*, two comedies by

Miguel Sanchez. "Nous signalons cette édition . . . parce que M. Rennert, se ralliant à l'opinion d'abord émise par M. Baist, montre que Sanchez a été non l'un des imitateurs, comme on l'avait toujours dit, mais bien le précurseur de Lope de Vega, en sorte que ses pièces ont de l'importance pour l'histoire du théâtre espagnol."—Erik Staaff. Le suffixe -*arius* dans les langues romanes (G. Paris). "Je n'ai pas trouvé au problème qui y est posé de solution qui me satisfasse pleinement . . . L'explication du suff. -*arjum* -*arja* en français et en provençal reste a trouver. Mais le livre de M. S. n'en est pas moins digne des plus grands éloges."—E. Koschwitz. Anleitung zum Studium der französischen Philologie. "Comme l'auteur est à la fois un philologue exercé, un excellent connaisseur du français moderne et un esprit original et indépendant, son livre mérite d'être lu même en dehors de ceux auxquels il s'adresse spécialement."—Em. Picot. Le duc d'Aumale et la Bibliothèque de Chantilly. "Notre savant collaborateur était mieux qualifié que personne pour écrire cette notice."—E. Gorra. Lingua e letteratura spagnuola delle origini. "Premier essai d'une anthologie de l'ancien castillan,—les recueils antérieurs ne méritant pas d'être cités."

<div style="text-align: right">H. A. Todd.</div>

PHILOLOGUS, LIV.

I, pp. 1–10. M. Fränkel: Das grosse Siegesdenkmal Attalos des Ersten. Perg. Insc. 21–28 show that the monument commemorates Attalos' war against Antiochos and the Galatians, ended in 228 B. C., and that seven successful battles were fought. The article is a reply to H. Gäbler, Erythrä, S. 45 ff.

P. 10. C. Radinger: Epigraphische Kleinigkeiten. Notes on the last part of the Bull. de corr. hellén. 1893.

II, pp. 11–15. E. Rohde: Metrische Inschrift aus Talmis. Text and notes to a wall-inscription published by Mahaffy in Bull. de corr. hellén. XVIII 150–51.

P. 15. J. Zingerle: Zu griechischen Epigrammen. Restoration of an elegiac tomb-inscription published in Bull. de corr. hellén. VII, p. 503.

III, pp. 16–63. J. Baunack: Zu den Inschriften aus Epidaurus. Criticism of Kabbadias' Fouilles d'Épidaure, chap. III, which contains the epigraphic material which Baunack supplements.

IV, pp. 64–79. S. Bruck: Ueber die Organisation der Athenischen Heliastengerichte im vierten Jahrh. v. Christen. Third paper, containing an account of the bronze (later wooden) tablets serving as the credentials of the heliasts. 42 whole and 50 fragmentary πινάκια have been found. The letters A–K (later other symbols also) designated the section of the court in which he

must sit. Many tablets had the stamp of an owl, perhaps refer-
ring to the three-obol fee. Many have a gorgon's-head in the
right margin; some of these contain also a double-owl, symbolic
of a two-obol fee. All those with the Gorgoneion are supposed
to have belonged to judges in civil processes.

P. 79. C. Radinger: Epigraphische Kleinigkeiten. Inscrip-
tions from Stratos, Eleutherna and Kara Hassan (Bull. corr. hell.
1893, p. 445 f.; 121 f. 629; p. 532) are corrected.

V, pp. 80–92. S. Sudhaus: Exkurse zu Philodem. 1. A liter-
ary quarrel in the Epikurean school. The ὑπομνηματικόν, mentioned
by Philodemos, p. 99. 30, was his commentary περὶ ῥητορικῆς. 2. A
scene from the Symposium of Epikuros, p. 102. 3. Nausiphanes
and Aristoteles in Philodemos. Some emendations in the parts
discussed in Rh. Mus. XLVIII.

VI, pp. 93–123. R. Foerster: Anecdota Choriciana Nova.
Text and critical apparatus to the orations of this sixth-century
sophist contained in Cod. Matutensis N 101 (= M).

VII, pp. 124–34. L. Traube: Zur lateinischen Anthologie.
I. On the Cod. Salmasianus, 23 conjectures, mostly single words.

VIII, pp. 135–42. O. Rossbach: Zu den Metamorphosen des
Apuleius. 17 conjectures. Appended is an hitherto unpublished
fable in 8 distichs, about an ass and his burden, in the style of
Avianus (Vaticanus 5088, fol. 82 and 83 r., saec. XIV).

P. 142. Cr.: Apul. Met. I 18, comments on two of Rossbach's
conjectures, pp. 136 and 138.

IX, pp. 143–9. C. v. Morawski: Zur Rhetorik bei den römi-
schen Schriftstellern. The influence of rhetorical studies on
various authors sufficiently accounts for apparent dependence of
one upon another.

P. 149. E. Ziebarth: De titulo Coo. "Insc. of Cas." 324
compared with Anth. Pal. VII 516 and interpreted. Addendum
on p. 296.

X, pp. 150–62. R. Maschke: Das älteste Fragment der römi-
schen Stadtchronik. I. In the passage about gold rings, Plin. H.
N. 33. 6. 17–19, acc. to Unger follows Valerius Antias (the argum.
is from ex multaticia, and the latter drew upon the annales ponti-
ficum. II. The facts relate to the beginning of the fourth century,
and were tampered with by Valerius.

P. 162. R. Unger: Lucani fragmentum, refers the vss. ap.
Lib. de Belluis, III 3, p. 23 sq., to Lucan's Orpheus.

XI, pp. 163–77. H. Schwarz: Ueber den Harleianus 2682 des
Cicero. Account with some readings based on Clark's collation
in the Anecdota Oxon., part VII of the class. series; discussion
of the relation of H. to other MSS.

P. 177. H. Deiter: Zu Cicero ad familiares, VIII 1. 4, reads perisse; inde (= therefore) urbe ac foro. In XV 4. 6 reads et toto deditus animo iis.

Miscellen, pp. 178–92.—1, pp. 178–81. B. Risberg: Einige Bemerkungen zu Aischylos' Choephoroi. Notes on vv. 42–73; 53–63; 50; 71; 130–31; 168; 234 ff.

2, pp. 181–3. A. Sonny: Zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte von M. Aurelius εἰς ἑαυτόν. The MSS few and late. Vat. 1950, s. XIV; and that used by Xylander 1558, which is lost. Important citation by Archbishop Arethas (saec. IX–X) may be found in Cod. Mosquensis 315.

3, pp. 183–4. E. Ziebarth gives 20 crit. marg. notes from one of H. Sauppe's copies of Athenagoras' libellus pro Christianis.

4, pp. 184–5. C. Weyman compares with Herondas, V 14 f., Origenes περὶ ἀρχῶν (cf. Bl. f. d. bayer. Gymnasialschulw. XXX 227 f.).

5, pp. 185–9. E. Riess: Epikritisches zur Astrologie des Nechepsos und Petosiris, rejects the dating proposed by F. Boll, Jahrb. f. Phil. Suppl. XXI 236–8, adhering to his former statement (Philol. Suppl. VI 329) that it is about the beginning of the Christian era.

6, pp. 189–90. J. Miller gives crit. notes on five passages in Livy, XXIII.

7, pp. 191–2. H. Schiller emends Hirtius, Praef. Bell. Gall. VIII.

8, p. 192. Th. Stangl: p. 388. 7 Halm's Rhet. Latini Minores, emends Julius Victor, *incuria* for *iniuria*.

XII, pp. 193–204. E. Kuhnert: Orpheus in der Unterwelt, maintains, against Milchhöfer (Philol. 53. 385 ff.), his former view that Orpheus on the vase-paintings of So. Italy is as "founder of the mysteries pleading with Persephone for a life of blessedness for those initiated into his rites." This function of mediation led to his being cited as a parallel to Christ, and to representations in the Catacombs.

XIII, pp. 205–10. F. Dümmler: Zwei Gortynische Urkunden. Date of B and C (Halbherr, Mon. Ant. I 8) "determined by the relations between Egypt and the Achaean league, Ptolemaeos Euergetes I would be the king who brought about peace."

P. 210. Cr.: Paris-Deiphobos Kult in Therapnai?, thinks there was not, and that Wide is wrong in his interpretation of a passage in the Theophrastos of Ainaeos of Gaza, p. 646 Migne.

XIV, pp. 211–52. H. Pomtow: Neue Gleichungen Attischer und Delphischer Archonten. Gives literary and epigraphic evidence for such contemporaneous archonships, with table; cf. pp. 356–73 (Supplementary).

XV, pp. 253–73. W. Schilling: Die Schlacht bei Marathon, a critical study. On pp. 272–3 the following summary is given:

1. The landing of the Persians at Marathon may have had in view a march on Athens, or a battle in the plain; the former was checked by the occupation of the passes, the latter when the Athenians awaited them in a fortified camp. 2. The quarrel among the generals took place in the camp, as to whether the position at Vrana should be evacuated and an engagement avoided, or held, and an attack ventured at a favorable opportunity. 3. The Persians waited in the plain for some time, hoping that the Athenians would advance to the attack or march off. 4. The Athenians' attack resulted in rout, as the Persians were in the act of retreating. 5. The Athenians' attack was a successful surprise of a Persian detachment near the modern Soros.

XVI, pp. 274–89. O. Schroeder: Pindarica. II. On early and late Pindaric MSS. Seven new late MSS described, three in the Vatican, four in the Barberini library, numbered according to Abel's system, 180–186. Also some notes on the known MSS and on the punctuation of B and D.

XVII, pp. 290–96. K. Busche: Zu Euripides Iphigenia in Aulis. Emends vs. 88, 376, 378, 573, 674, 925.

XVIII, pp. 297–310. C. Radinger: Der Stephanos des Meleagros von Gadara. Discussion of the double lemmata due to copyists, marginal notes, etc. The contents of this, the first great collection of Greek epigrams, were arranged so that the poems of Meleager formed the connecting chain, as is best seen in book V.

XIX, pp. 311–18. J. Zahlfleisch: Kritisches zu Aristoteles. Consideration of ten passages of the Metaphysics and two of the Ethics.

XX, pp. 319–44. E. Schroeder: Ueber die Weltkarte und Chorographie des Kaisers Augustus. This first paper deals with the map of the world begun by M. Agrippa and continued after his death in 12 B. C. by Augustus. It is likely that copies of this map existed into the Middle Ages, as seen by examination of the tabula Peutingeriana and others. It is likely that a descriptive work, Chorographia, was published with the map and that Mela and Pliny made use of it. But this is to be taken up in a subsequent paper (XXXI, pp. 528–59).

XXI, pp. 345–55. Th. Stangl: Zu Halm's Rhetores Latini Minores. Remarks on the Latinity.

P. 355. A. Weiske: Notes on Vergil, Aen. VII 497. 378 ff.

Miscellen, pp. 356–84.—9, pp. 356–73. H. Pomtow: Die Datirung der XII. delphischen Priesterzeit. Down to 91–90 B. C. or 84 B. C. or determined to within seven years. Supplementary to pp. 211–52.

10, pp. 374–5. E. Rohde: Orphisch, attempts to restore the original Greek Orphic words from a Latin translation in Aristot. pseudepigr., p. 649, ed. Rose.

11, pp. 376-7. S. Mekler: Ποντοναύτης, emends from Nauck, Tr. Gr. Fr.², n. 511 to ἥπτοντο· ναῦται τῶν ταλαιπώρων βύθων.

12, pp. 377-80. R. Ehwald: Vergiliana. (1) Eumolpos' version of the Laocoon myth in Petron. 89 shows other than Vergilian sources. (2) Interpretation of Aen. IV 436.

13, pp. 380-83. O. Crusius: Zu den Einsiedler Bucolica. In the first poem Thamyras and Ladas are contrasted. There seems to be a lacuna after vs. 25.

14, p. 384. Cr.: Zur 'Kritischen Grundlage des Herondas textes. Reply to A. B. Drachmann (Nord Tidskr. III 152).

XXII, pp. 385-95. Fr. Hauser: Beim Erntefest. Discussion of an Attic bowl in the Castellani collection in Rome, and a statue in the room of the Dying Gaul in the Capitolian Museum, both representing deipnophoroi at the Thargelia or Pyanepsia.

P. 395. Cr.: Λευκαρίων—Δευκαλίων; emendation to the Etymologikon Flor., p. 204 Mill.

XXIII, pp. 396-402. J. Ilberg: De Hippocratis Epidemiorum libri tertii characteribus. The 'signs' of diseases, so garbled in the MSS, may be approximately restored from Galen.

P. 402. P. Sakolowski emends ἔμπορος to εὔπλοος in Anth. X 23. 5, and in XI 84 reads πέντε τριαζόμενος in two words.

XXIV, pp. 403-29. A. Bonhöffer: Zur stoischen Psychologie. Exception is taken to the position of L. Ganter (Philol. 1894, p. 465 ff.), Das stoische System der αἴσθησις. B. treats especially of the ἀναθυμίασις of the blood, the parts of the soul and the process of αἴσθησις.

XXV, pp. 430-37. C. Wunderer: Der poetische Brief des Polybius an Demetrius I (later Soter), 162-150 B. C., king of Syria. Under Antiochus IV he was hostage at Rome, fleeing to Syria on his death, helped by Polybius, who in this epistle gives him good advice. Text may be restored by aid of Eurip. Phoen. 726 ff.; the last verse is from Epicharmus acc. to Polyb. 18, 40, 4. The others are γνῶμαι.

P. 437. J. Marquart: Zu Ktesias, reads the genuine Aeolic Τιμαφένης for Τιμαφέρνης. The patronymic Τιμαφένειος is supported by Hoffmann, Gr. Dialekte, II 499.

XXVI, pp. 438-54. H. Koch: Proklus als Quelle des Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita in der Lehre vom Bösen. (Written independently, and before Stiglmayr, Histor. Jahrb. XVI (1895), H. 2.) If D. used Pr., then he must have composed his works before the closing of the heathen schools of philosophy at Athens in 529 A. D.

XXVII, pp. 455-63. R. Ehwald: Ueber Delia und Genossinnen. If in Apul. Apol. X we read *Plancia* for *Plania* (Tibullus' Delia), we can account for the use of the epithet of Diana by

numismatic evidence. Coins of the gens Plancia bear the image of Diana. Apuleius' mention of Perilla for Metella seems based on Ovid, Tr. 433–8, which is thought to be an interpolation.

XXVIII, pp. 464–73. B. Kübler: Zur Chronologie des Prozesses gegen Verres. Cic. took his Sicilian trip in the beginning of the year. It is doubtful why he returned so soon.

XXIX, pp. 474–88. O. Crusius: Zu den alten Fabeldichtern. 1. Avianus and the so-called Apologi Aviani. The latter are mediaeval paraphrases and of little value for the textual critic.

XXX, pp. 489–527. J. Marquart: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran. 1. Diodoros' testimony concerning the royal house of Pontos and Kappadokia; a contribution to the estimation of Agatharchides and Ephoros. 2. Trogus Pompeius' relation to Diodoros in the Persian history. 3. The so-called Zariadris-coins and the Princes of Sophene according to Mar Abas and Ps. Moses Xorenaci. 4. On the lists of Assyrian and Median kings in Ktesias.

XXXI, pp. 528–59. E. Schroeder: Ueber die Weltkarte und Chorographie des Kaisers Augustus. Second paper (v. art. XX, pp. 319–44). The Roman Chorography as the main source of the geographical descriptions of Mela and Pliny Maj. Strabo six times cites an anonymous Roman chorographia written at the request of Augustus. It probably accompanied and explained the great map.

P. 559. Cr.: Solon 21, reads καλλείποιμι for ποιήσαιμι in Bergk, P. L. II, p. 48.

XXXII, pp. 560–65. W. Kroll: Zu den Zauberpapyri. Emendations to Leyd. Pap. V. W.; Paris, etc.

P. 565. Cr.: Semon. Amorg. fr. 29, p. 457 Bgk., is to be assigned to Simonides of Ceos.

Miscellen, pp. 566–76.—15, pp. 566–7. L. Holzapfel: Zu Thuk. VI 10.

16, pp. 567–74. Fr. Susemihl: Ueber Thrasyllos; and also Zu Laert. Diog. III 56–62.

17, pp. 574–6. E. Ziebarth: Kritische Randnoten aus Handexemplaren Hermann Sauppes. II. Zu den Vitae des Plutarch.

18, p. 576. O. Cr.: Ein Tragikerfragment bei Lucian, Peregrin. 39, p. 360 R. ἔλιπον γᾶν, βαίνω δ' ἐς Ὄλυμπον, is probably from some lost 'Herakles.'

XXXIII, pp. 577–86. Zu Xenophon's Agesilaos. Xen. more influenced by Gorgias than by the Euagoras of Isocrates. The Agesilaos resembles the Memorabilia in arrangement, the Cyropaedia in contents; in tone it echoes the Herakles of Antisthenes the Cynic.

REPORTS.

P. 586. E. Hesselmeyer: Sophokles' Antigone 1118 ff., prefers reading 'Ἰταλίαν, because two years before the presentation (B. C. 441) the Athenians had founded Thurii.

XXXIV, pp. 587–98. H. Pomtow: Noch einmal die XII. delphische Priesterzeit (vide art. pp. 356–70).

P. 598. R. Ellis finds Claudian, c. XXII in Cod. Bodl. auct. G. Rawlinson, 108 fol. 72ᵇ.

XXXV, pp. 599–619. P. Thouvenin: Untersuchungen über den Modus-gebrauch bei Aelian. I. Substantive use of the infinitive. II. Temporal clauses. III. Consecutive clauses. IV. Causal clauses.

XXXVI, pp. 620–35. B. Maurenbrecher: Die altlateinische Duenosinschrift. Bibliography since 1880, and discussion.

XXXVII, pp. 636–53. E. Drerup: Epikritisches zum Panegyrikus des Isokrates. The Cyprian war lasted from 390–380, and the Panegyrikus must have been published in the latter year —it is a turning-point in the whole development of Greek rhetorical prose.

XXXVIII, pp. 654–709. E. Reimann: Quo ex fonte fluxerit Nicolai Damasceni παραδόξων ἐθῶν συναγωγή—i. e. Ephorus.

P. 709. Cr. discusses Λακωνικὸν τρόπον.

XXXIX, pp. 710–44. O. Crusius: Litterargeschichtliche Parerga. I. Criticism of the ancient views as to the authenticity of the Homeric poems. II. The poet Pigres and his friends.

P. 744. O. Crusius: Plato und der Homerbios. Phaedr., p. 243A shows that Plato knew a legend according to which Homer, like Stesichoros, was blinded by Helena.

Miscellen, pp. 745–52.—19, p. 745. Cr.: Theopomp bei Babrius.
20, p. 746. Cr.: Ad Plutarchi de proverbiis Alexandrinorum libellum addendum.
21, pp. 746–9. R. Ellis: Ad Cic. Epp., critical notes on Greek quotations.
22, p. 749. Cr.: Ein falsches Pliniuscitat in Lobeck Agl.
23, p. 750. Fr. Krebs: Zum Berliner Papyrus 347 (vide Philol. LII 577).
24, pp. 751–2. A. Milchhöfer: Noch einmal Orpheus in der Unterwelt (vide supra, p. 193 ff.).

YALE UNIVERSITY.   GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

BRIEF MENTION.

The first part of VON DOBSCHÜTZ'S *Christusbilder* (Leipzig, Hinrichs) appeared early enough in the year to win a reference in USENER's *Sintfluthsagen* (A. J. P. XX 210); the second part, with its *Beilagen*, has just come to hand. The work, which forms the third volume of VON GEBHARDT AND HARNACK'S *Texte u. Untersuchungen zur altchristlichen Literatur*, appeals to wider circles than could have been reached by its predecessors, and in default of a critical study, which could hardly be expected here, it would be a pleasure to give the readers of the Journal an outline of VON DOBSCHÜTZ'S researches and results. But as the space at my command is limited, I must be content with this *Brief Mention*. The title, *Christusbilder*, as the writer himself admits, is somewhat misleading, and it would be a pity if a student of art should invest his thirty-two marks in a work on Christian Art and find instead a treatise on Early Christian Literature. Catalogues have led to many laughable errors; the sombre verse of Young's Night Thoughts was palmed off in its day by unscrupulous peddlers as an English companion to the Basia of Johannes Secundus; the seductive title of the Diversions of Purley was a standing joke among our grandfathers; and Daudet's Sapho figures in the annals of the Greek Lyric. The subtitle, it is true, would save the intending purchaser from such a mistake as our author deprecates, but people who order books do not always scan subtitles closely. In consonance with the whole character of modern research, VON DOBSCHÜTZ'S investigations trace the growth of Christian institutions back to the heathen soil from which they sprung, and the first chapter deals with the δωπετῆ of antiquity from Homer down. The aversion of the Early Church to pictures of Our Lord was fully overcome only when Christianity became the religion of the state and entered upon the inheritance of all the paraphernalia of the earlier faith. In after-times, especially in the Greek Church, the ζωγράφος was counted a manner of λογογράφος, the painter a gospeller and the picture became for some the sole evangel. The heathen 'image which fell down from Jupiter,' one of the beasts which Paul fought with at Ephesus, was succeeded by the ἀχειροποίητος (εἰκών); and the history of these miraculous likenesses of Our Saviour is given in detail. A long chapter is taken up with the Legend of Abgar and the Christ of Edessa, another with the story of Veronica, the Βερονίκη, whose Latin name lent itself to the anagram *Vera icon*. The authorities are given at the end of the book and the passages quoted in full. So, for instance, the

chapter on the Palladium is backed by a long array of extracts extending from Homer to the sham Eudokia (A. J. P. III 489, IV 109, V 114, VII 104), a fraud which, as VON DOBSCHÜTZ observes, the specimen given here would suffice to expose. The second part, containing the *Beilagen*, presents us with a number of documents pertaining to the various chapters, some of them in new editions and emended texts, some published for the first time,—a mine of curious reading, not without occasional profit for the philological soul.

Just at this time there are signs of a reaction in favor of Cicero (A. J. P. XVIII 242), and it is a somewhat scurvy trick of Fortune that interest should be revived in the great Ciceromastix DRU-MANN by a new edition of his inevitable work, *Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung, oder Pompeius, Caesar, Cicero und ihre Zeitgenossen* (Berlin, Gebrüder Borntraeger). The publishers tell us that this reproduction is due in a measure to the liberal support of the von Siemens grandchildren of the historian, who doubtless take a pride in the political attitude of the author and rejoice in his triphammer way of dealing with those who strove to uphold republican institutions. "Der Preusse, der Unterthan eines Friedrich Wilhelm," says Drumann at the close of his preface, "kann kein anderes politisches Glaubensbekenntnis haben als: $\dot{\eta}$ μουναρχίη κράτιστον." For 'Frederick William the Third' read 'William the Second,' and history repeats itself. But the reader of Herodotos will not forget that the sentiment was put in the mouth of Darius, who as the future winner had the last word assigned to him. The editor, P. GROEBE, announces that he has made no change in the text beyond the correction of a few manifest errors. In the footnotes the references have been altered to suit the new editions of the original authorities, and some use has been made of those post-Drumannian works that, in the judgment of the editor, mark an advance in the treatment of the subject. Of course, there are those who tax DRUMANN with gross partisanship, unscrupulous pettifoggery and remorseless vindictiveness, and put not the slightest faith in his profession that his results were forced on him. And yet those who are least indulgent to him are fain to acknowledge that he has been most diligent in his research, and all who have wrought in the same domain have levied freely on the quarry that he has opened. The first volume of the new edition is occupied chiefly with the great triumvir, Mark Antony. An appendix contains considerable additions by the editor (pp. 399–484).

'Source' is a word of fear to those who have been brought into contact with the swarm of dissertations which deal with the *fontes*

of this and the *fontes* of that, many of them tedious, mechanical and inconclusive. What is properly a *Quelle* is a matter of dispute which Professor BAUER, in the volume recently noticed (A. J. P. XX 225), does not undertake to settle. But whether we limit the word to an historical composition or extend it to an historical document of any kind, there is no question about the usefulness of such a collection as VON SCALA has made in his *Staatsverträge des Alterthums* (Teubner), the first part of which appeared too late to be included in Bauer's review of the decennium 1888–1898. This part begins with a treaty between Karaindaš of Babylonia and the King of Egypt, 1450 B. C., and ends with the extension of the Sicilian rule under Timoleon 338. The second part will comprise the treaties made to 476 A. D., and awaits the collation of the inscriptions.

In a recent number of the *Revue des études grecques*, G. D., commenting on BOLLING'S *Participle in Hesiod*, says: "Je crois que bien interprétée, la statistique appliquée à un ouvrage homogène peut rendre de grands services. Mais il me semble qu'il n'y a rien ou presque rien à tirer de la comparaison de deux statistiques, reposant sur deux ouvrages de dates et d'auteurs différents. Que peut bien démontrer la statistique comparée du nombre des participes par cent vers dans l'*Iliade*, l'*Odyssée*, la *Théogonie*, les *Travaux et les Jours*, le *Bouclier d'Héraclès*, si non que le style et les idées de ces divers poëmes sont essentiellement dissemblables?" Such curiosities of criticism are worth preserving as specimens of the hopeless divergencies of view to be found in the realm of grammatical studies. As an early worker in statistical syntax I have always held that if there is any value in this line of research, and I do not exaggerate that value (A. J. P. XIII 123), it lies precisely in the exact measure it gives of the development of style and the sphere of constructions, and from my first published study to the last number of the Journal (XX 227) I have emphasized the importance of comparative statistics. But while I am not quite ready to say εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα, I am liberal enough to record an *obiter dictum*, which quietly disposes of a great deal of hard work that has been done in this field of research, and so I give the French scholar his fling in the Journal itself, where so much space has been given to statistical syntax.

To translate the Greek participle by a subordinate sentence, temporal, causal, conditional, is a makeshift. To translate it by an abstract noun is a makeshift. Neither of these devices reproduces the true effect of the participle, which belongs to its substantive like a skin—not a human skin, but, let us say, a dog's skin. Hence I am not surprised that Professor STAHL, in a

recent number of the *Rheinisches Museum* (LIV 3), has declined to accept some of the examples in which I suggested the abstract translation. See A. J. P. XIX 463. The German scholar is under the domination of German tradition, as Classen was (A. J. P. VI 314, IX 138); and doubtless my renderings are determined by the atmospheric pressure of the English idiom. The great thing after all is to feel the Greek participle directly (Pindar, I. E., cx), and so, for instance, it is better not to analyze Theognis 509: οἶνος πινόμενος πουλὺς κακόν, although it is in my judgment demonstrable that the Greeks came to use the participle consciously as a condensed form of a subordinate clause (XVIII 244, 369), and although Theognis himself teaches us how to do it in this particular case by adding: ἢν δέ τις αὐτὸν | πίνῃ ἐπισταμένως οὐ κακὸν ἀλλ' ἀγαθόν. Nor are we to recast the words in our mind, whatever we may do in translation, although Theognis himself has given us the other version (v. 211): οἶνόν τοι πίνειν πουλὺν κακόν. Professor STAHL is still under the impression that Thukydides has an unusual proportion of participles that may be rendered by an abstract formula. If so, this is one of the points that show a certain congeniality between Thukydides and those Latin authors that favor this turn. "Permagna est," said Lübbert many years ago (Comment. Synt. Partic. I), "scriptorum in hoc idiomate ponendo pro cuiusque vel ingenio vel scribendi proposito diversitas: nam sunt qui eo mirum quantum delectentur, sunt qui prorsus ab eo abstineant. Et confert illud sane plurimum ad certum aliquem colorem orationi imponendum: nam cum in universum poeticum semper ornatum adferat, modo ita ponitur, ut vivam ipsarum rerum imaginem experimant . . . modo miram vim et brevitatem orationi adfert cum nomen abstractum quod vocant ad res e vita ipsa petitas refertur." Assuredly, this use of the participle seems to give a higher note. We expect it in Pindar. We do not expect it in Strabo, and yet we find it X 5. 4: τὴν Δῆλον ηὔξησε . . . κατασκαφεῖσα ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων Κόρινθος, which is exactly parallel with the only Pindaric example that STAHL frankly accepts, Pyth. XI 22, I. E., cxiii.

———

Professor WEIL's new edition of the *Medea* (Hachette) is styled *troisième edition revisée*, while his *Iphigenia at Aulis* appears in a *troisième edition remaniée*. The text of the third Medea differs from that of the second in twenty passages, duly recorded after the list of MSS. The text of the third Iphigenia differs from that of the second in thirty-two passages, also registered in advance, a feature quite in keeping with the editor's admirable economy of his reader's time. It is hard to define τὸ φορτικόν, but in philology puffiness is a phase of it, and it is precisely the absence of puffiness that gives a certain aristocratic distinction to M. WEIL's editorial work, to which I have repeatedly done homage. In the third edition of the I. A., M. WEIL has

24

not budged from the conservative position he held in the second edition (A. J. P. II 267), and while he does not withhold from Mr. ENGLAND'S work (A. J. P. XIII 496) the praise it deserves, he shrinks from the 'difficult and daring' attempt to go back to the MS of the poet himself. Among the new readings in I. A. may be mentioned v. 823, where the μή in οὐ θαῦμά σ' ἡμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν οὓς μή πάρος has given the editors some trouble. "The same generalizing μή," says England, "as at v. 834, but it is slightly more remarkable here, as the relative with which it is joined has its antecedent," and so much more remarkable does M. WEIL consider it that he changes the ἡμᾶς of the text into δῆτά σ'—in my judgment, quite unnecessarily. See A. J. P. I 54, where the point is covered, several of the passages cited having antecedents expressed. Add Herodot. 3, 21 and revise Stein's note on 3, 65. M. WEIL still considers v. 418: ὥστε τερφθείης ἰδών, a vicious reading, and England, who brackets the line, says that it is 'actually defended' by certain scholars there named, who have thereby, I suppose, damned themselves eternally. That there is a possible way of escape without the loss of one's grammatical soul, I have already intimated (A. J. P. VII 173). Indeed, I have long been of the opinion that enough scope has not been given to the imperative optative (Pindar, I. E., civ), and if the imperative after ὥστε is not a monster, why should an imperative optative be?

I had resolved to say nothing about Professor HARRY's *Hippolytus* (Ginn), for somewhat the same reason that I declined to bestow any special commendation on BLAKE's *Hellenica* (A. J. P. XVI 262); but the printer needs a few lines. Both the editors have expressed themselves as indebted to my work and both the editors have made large use of my formulae—BLAKE with almost painful scrupulousness of reference, whereas HARRY has not thought it worth while to particularize, except in a few instances. It is one of the rewards and at the same time one of the penalties of long activity as a teacher and as a writer, to find one's self depersonalized. But, after all, it is better to live on as a nameless rule than to be set up like the Canon Dawesianus, for every rudesby to have a shy at.

CORRECTION.—For 'the great Pendragonship' in the last number of the Journal, p. 213, l. 13 from bottom, read 'the barge of Arthur.'

E. W. F.: ERRATA AND CORRIGENDA.—In my article on *Infitias it*, vol. XX, No. 2, in §6, l. 4 read 'ap. Nonium'; §17, ll. 3, 11, 36 read 'Predicative' for 'Appositive'; §17, l. 37 read 'agreeing with' for 'appositive to'; §20, l. 6 read '*redieit*,' not '*redicit*.'

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Antoninus (Marcus Aurelius), Selections from; tr., with an introd., by B. E. Smith. New York, *The Century Co.*, 1899. 26 + 202 pp. 12mo, leath., $1.

Appian. Roman History; tr. by Horace White. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 2 v. 68 + 413, 34 + 554 pp. Maps, il. 12mo, cl., $3.

Caesar's 'Civil War,' Selections from, Bk. 3; by E. H. Atherton. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899. 15 + 188 pp. 16mo, cl., 50 cts.

Cicero (M. T.) Pro A. Cluentio oratio; ed. by W. Peterson. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 56 + 271 pp. 16mo, cl., net 75 cts.

Darmesteter (Arsène). A Historical French Grammar; ed. by Ernest Muret and Leopold Sudre. English ed., by Alphonse Hartog. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 48 + 936 pp. 12mo, cl., net $2.75.

Euclid. The Elements of Euclid, by I. Todhunter. New ed., rev. and enl. by S. L. Loney. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 8 + 332 + 132 pp. 12mo, cl., net $1.

—— Elements of Geometry, bks. 3 and 4, by C. Smith and Sophie Bryant. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 6 + 161–288 pp. 16mo, cl., net 60 cts.

Homer. Homer's Iliad, books 19–24; ed., on the basis of the Ameis-Hentze edition, by E. B. Clapp. Boston, *Ginn & Co.* [1899]. 8 + 441 pp. Il. 12mo, cl., $1.90.

Koschwitz (E.) The Study of Colloquial and Literary French, adapted by P. Shaw Jeffrey. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 26 + 292 pp. 12mo, cl., net $1.10.

Plutarch. Plutarch's Lives; Englished by Sir T. North; ed. by W. H. D. Rouse. In 10 v. Vs. 7 and 8. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 16mo, cl., @ 50 cts.; limp leath., @ 75 cts.

Tarbell (H. S. and Martha). Lessons in Language and Grammar. Bk. 2. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1899. c. 16 + 431 pp. 12mo, cl., 70 cts.

Taylor (I.) The History of the Alphabet. New rev. cheaper ed. New York, *C. Scribner's Sons*, 1899. 2 v. 358, 398 pp. Il. 8vo, cl., $5.

Thucydides. Selections from bk. 7, ed. by E. C. Marchant. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 14 + 106 pp. 18mo, cl., net 40 cts.

Virgil. Aeneid, bk. 12; ed. by T. E. Page. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899. 24 + 171 pp. 32mo, cl., net 40 cts.

ENGLISH.

The Book of the Dead. Transl. by E. A. W. Budge. London, 1899. Fol. £2 10s.

Chadwick (H. M.) Studies in Old English. Cambridge, 1899. 8vo. 6s.

Durand (A.) et Cheikho (L.) Elementa grammaticae arabicae. Beryti, 1897. 8vo, 486 pp. m. 12.

Greek Papyri (B. C. 100 to A. D. 700) in the British Museum. Catalogue, with texts. Vol. II. Edited by F. G. Kenyon. London, 1899. 4to. £2 10s. Atlas of facs., 123 plates, £5.

Lonsdale (A. W.) Burmese Grammar and Grammatical Analysis. London, 1899. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Saga of King Sverri of Norway (Sverrissaga). Transl. by J. Sephton. London, 1899. 4to, 310 pp. With 8 maps. 15s.

FRENCH.

Audouin (E.) De la déclinaison dans les langues indo-européennes. Gr. in-8. *C. Klincksieck.* 8 fr.

—— De Plautii anapaestis. 1 vol. In-8. *C. Klincksieck.* 4 fr.

Ballin (L.) Le Mahâbhârata. In-8. *Leroux.* 10 fr.

Boissier (A.) Documents assyriens relatifs aux présages. In-4. *Bouillon.* 18 fr.

Bollack (L.) La langue bleue. 1 vol. In-16. *Edit. de la langue bleue.* 10 fr.

Guerlin de Guer. Essai de dialectologie normande. In-8. *Bouillon.* 10 fr.

Huart (C.) Le livre de la création et de l'histoire de Abou-zéid Ahmed Ben Sahl El-Balkhi. In-8. *Leroux.* 20 fr.

Masqueray (P.) Traité de métrique grecque. In-12. *C. Klincksieck.* 3 fr. 50.

Mâzuc (E.) Grammaire languedocienne (dialecte de Pézenas). In-8. Toulouse, *E. Privat.* 7 fr. 50.

Mohl (G.) Introduction à la chronologie du latin vulgaire. In-8. *Bouillon.* 10 fr.

Rat (G.) Al Mostatraf. In-8. *Leroux.* 15 fr.

Vinson (J.) Manuel de la langue hindoustani. In-12. *Maisonneuve.* 10 fr.

GERMAN.

Anthologia graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea, ed. Hugo Stadtmueller. Vol. II, pars 1. Palatinae librum VII, Planudeae l. III continens. 8. xcii, 524 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 8.

Beiträge, Bonner, zur Anglistik. Hrsg. v. M. Trautmann. 4. Hft. gr. 8. Bonn, *P. Hanstein.*—4. Padelford (Freder. Morgan). Old English Musical Terms. xii, 112 S. m. 3.20.

—— Münchener, zur romanischen u. englischen Philologie. XVI. u. XVII. gr. 8. Leipzig, *A. Deichert Nachf.*—XVI. Reinsch (Hugo). Ben Jonson's Poetik u. seine Beziehungen zu Horaz. x, 130 S. m. 3.—XVII. Molenaar (Heinr.) Robert Burns' Beziehungen zur Litteratur. xii, 132 S. m. 3.60.

—— zur romanischen Philologie. Festgabe f. Gustav Gröber. gr. 8. v, 540 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 16.

Bibliothek, assyriologische, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. XIV. Bd. gr. 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—XIV. Craig (James A.) Astrological-astronomical Texts. ix S. u. 95 Bl. m. 30.

Bibliothek, assyriologische. XV. Bd. gr. 4. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*—XV. Price (I. M.) The Great Cylinder-Inscriptions A and B of Gudea. Pt. 1. Text and Sign-List. vi S. m. 1 Abbildg. u. 111 Bl. m. 34.

—— romanische, hrsg. v. Wendelin Förster. XVI. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.*—XVI. Vega (Lope de). Los Guzmanes de Toral, pubb. dal Antonio Restori. xx, 100 S. m. 1 Taf. m. 3.60.

Bottek (Ed.) Die ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Conjunctivs in lateinischen Nebensätzen. 1. Thl.: Ut-, Ne-, Quo-, Quominus-, Quin-, Relativ- u. Cum-Sätze. gr. 8. 94 S. Wien, *A. Hölder.* m. 1.80.

Christian v. Troyes. Sämtliche erhaltene Werke. Hrsg. v. Wendelin Förster. 4. Bd. Der Karrenritter (Lancelot) u. das Wilhelmsleben (Guillaume d'Angleterre). gr. 8. clxxxiv, 499 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 20.

Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca. Edita consilio et auctoritate academiae Borussicae. Vol. III, pars 2. Lex. 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer.*—III 2. Alexandri in Aristotelis meteorologicorum libros commentaria. Ed. Mich. Hayduck. xiii, 256 S. m. Fig. m. 10.20.

Cuers (H.) Bildung u. Bedeutungswandel französischer Infinitive beim Uebergang aus dem Lateinischen. Progr. gr. 4. xxxxii S. Frankfurt a. M. Leipzig, *Renger.* m. 1.50.

Cynewulf's Elene. Mit e. Glossar hrsg. v. Jul. Zupitza. 4. Aufl. gr. 8. ix, 89 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 2.

Decurtins (C.) Rätoromanische Chrestomathie. V. Bd.: Oberengadinisch, Unterengadinisch. 1. Lfg.: Das XVI. Jahrh. gr. 8. 324 S. Erlangen, *F. Junge.* m. 10.

Dimitrijević (Milan R.) Studia Hesiodea. gr. 8. iii, 234 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 6.

Finck (Frz. Nik.) Die araner Mundart. 2 Bde. Grammatik u. Wörterbuch. gr. 8. x, 224 u. ii, 349 S. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.* m. 18.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft. Hrsg. v. Iwan v. Müller. 8. Bd. 2. Tl. 1. Hälfte. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck.*—VIII 2. Schanz (Mart.) Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. 2. Tl. 1. Hälfte. Die augustische Zeit. 2. Aufl. Mit alphabet. Register. xii, 372 S. m. 7.

Inscriptiones graecae insularum maris Aegaei. Fasc. II. Fol. Berlin, *G. Reimer.*—II. Inscriptiones graecae insularum Lesbi, Nesi, Tenedi. Ed. G. R. Paton. Additae sunt tabulae geographicae duae. vii, 156 S. Kart., m. 17.50.

Ioannes Philoponus. De aeternitate mundi contra Proclum. Ed. Hugo Rabe. 8. xiv, 699 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* m. 10.

Kaiser (Adf.) Die Fastnachtspiele v. der Actio de sponsu. gr. 8. 139 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.* m. 3.

Kraus (Carl). Heinrich v. Veldeke. Mit e. Excurs v. Eward Schröder. gr. 8. xv, 192 S. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* m. 5.

Lagererantz (Otto). Zur griechischen Lautgeschichte. gr. 8. iii, 156 S. Upsala, *Akadem. Buchh.* m. 3.40.

Liebich (Bruno). Die Wortfamilien der lebenden hochdeutschen Sprache als Grundlage f. e. System der Bedeutungslehre. 6. Lfg. Lex. 8. S. 401–521. Breslau, *Preuss & Jünger.* m. 1.60; Kplt., m. 10; geb., m. 12.

Müller (D. H.) Südarabische Alterthümer im kunsthistorischen Hofmuseum. Fol. v, 95 S. m. 28 Abbildgn. u. 14 Lichtdr.-Taf. Wien, *A. Hölder.* m. 25.

Newcomer (C. B.) De Cyclope Homerico atque Euripideo. Diss. gr. 8. 27 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.

Nöldeke (Th.) Die semitischen Sprachen. Eine Skizze. 2. Aufl. iii, 76 S. Leipzig, *Ch. H. Tauchnitz*. Kart., m. 2.

Pallioppi (Emil). Wörterbuch der romanischen Mundarten des Ober- u. Unterengadins, des Münsterthals, v. Bergün u. Filisur. In 4 Lfgn. 1. Lfg. gr. 8. S. 1–240. Samaden. Basel, *A. Geering*. m. 5.

Ribbeck (Otto). Reden u. Vorträge. gr. 8. v, 308 S. m. Bildnis. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 6; geb., m. 8.

Rosenak (Leop.) Die Fortschritte der hebräischen Sprachwissenschaft von Jehuda Chajjûg bis David Kimchi. X. bis XIII. Jahrh. 1. Tl. gr. 8. viii, 47 S. Bremen. Frankfurt a. M., *J. Kauffmann*. m. 2.

Schwan (Ed.) Grammatik des Altfranzösischen. Neu bearb. v. Dietr. Behrens. 4. Aufl. gr. 8. viii, 266 S. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*. m. 5.40.

Studien, Grazer, zur deutschen Philologie. VI. Hft. gr. 8. Graz, *Styria.—* Ranftl (Joh.) Ludwig Tiecks Genoveva. xii, 258 S. m. 5.

—— Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie. 19. Bd. 1. Hft. gr. 8. 177 S. m. 1 Fig. Leipzig, *S. Hirzel*. m. 6.

Uhlenbeck (C. C.) Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache. 2. Bd. gr. 8. S. 161–367. Amsterdam, *J. Müller*. m. 5; Kplt., m. 9.

Vitruvii de architectura libri decem. Iterum ed. Valent. Rose. 8. xxx, 317 S. m. Fig. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 5.

Weise (F. Osk.) Charakteristik der lateinischen Sprache. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. vii, 172 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Wilcken (Ulr.) Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten u. Nubien. 2 Bde. gr. 8. xi, 860 u. v, 497 S. m. 3 farb. Taf. Leipzig, *Giesecke & Devrient*. m. 42; geb., m. 46.

Wilmanns (W.) Deutsche Grammatik. Gotisch, Alt-, Mittel- u. Neuhochdeutsch. 2. Abtlg.: Wortbildung. 2. Aufl. gr. 8. xvi, 671 S. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 12.50.

Winckler (Hugo). Altorientalische Forschungen. 2. Reihe. II. Bd. 2. Hft. (XII der ganzen Folge). gr. 8. Leipzig, *E. Pfeiffer.—*2. Die Zeit v. Ezras Ankunft in Jerusalem. Zur Geschichte des alten Arabien: V. Nebukadnezar u. Kedar.—VI. Die arab. Kasdim. Ko'a u. Sho'a. Zum Buche Jona. Zum Buche Judith. Zur kleinasiat. Geschichte. Philokles, König der Sidonier. Aus dem Archiv v. Ninive. Amelu. Zu den kartagisch-röm. Verträgen. S. 241–320. m. 4.40.

Zacharias Rhetor, des, sogenannte Kirchengeschichte. In deutscher Uebersetzg. hrsg. v. K. Ahrens u. G. Krüger. 8. xlv, 42 u. 417 S. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 10.

ITALIAN.

Nardelli (G.) Et que atque ac. Osservazioni intorno all' uso delle congiunzioni copulative latine. Roma. 8vo, p. 24. L. —60.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Annonce d'une édition phototypique d'un Évangile Arménien, manuscrit écrit sur parchemin en l'an 887. Moscou, *L'Institut Lazareff.* 60 fr.

Ἀθηνᾶ, σύγγραμμα περιοδικόν. Τόμος ἑνδέκατος, τεῦχος τρίτον. Ἀθήνῃσιν, 1899.

Cicero, Eleven Orations of, with introduction, notes and vocabulary. By Robert W. Tunstall. (Gildersleeve-Lodge Latin Series.) New York, *University Publishing Co.,* 1899. $1.20.

Conway (R. S.) The Use of the Singular *nos* in Cicero's Letters. (Advance copy.)

Dobschütz (E. v.) Christusbilder. Untersuchungen zur christlichen Legende. II. Hälfte. Beilagen. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung,* 1899.

Drumann (W.) Geschichte Roms in seinem Uebergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung. Zweite Aufl., herausg. von P. Groebe. Berlin, *Gebrüder Bornträger,* 1899. 10 m.

Educational Review. Ed. by N. M. Butler. Sept., Oct., 1899. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.,* 1899. $3 per annum.

English Dictionary (The). Ed. by James A. H. Murray. HORIZONTALITY-HYNE; I-IN (vol. V). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* @ $1.25.

Euripides. Hippolytus. Edited with introduction, notes and critical appendix. By J. E. Harry. Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1899.

Forman (L. L.) A First Greek Book. New York and London, *Harper & Brothers,* 1899.

Gildersleeve (B. L.) and Lodge (G.) Latin Composition. New York, *University Publishing Co.,* 1899. 75 cts.

—— — Key to Latin Composition. 60 cts.

Greenough, D'Ooge and Daniell. Second Year Latin. Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1899.

Hempl (George). *Pepper, pickle* and *kipper.* (Reprint from 'Publ. of M. L. Ass. of Am.' XIV 4.)

—— *Skaekja, Karl, Kerl, Kegel,* etc. (Reprint from 'J. of Germ. Phil.' II 2.)

Holthausen (F.) Altsächsisches Elementarbuch. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter,* 1899. 5 m.

Homer's Iliad. Bks. XIX–XXIV. Ed. on the basis of the Ameis-Hentze ed., by Edward Bull Clapp. Boston, *Ginn & Co.,* 1899.

Hübner (E.) Inscriptions latines d'Espagne. (Tirage à part de la 'Revue des études anciennes.') I 3. Bordeaux, *Feret et fils,* 1899.

Jahn (Albert). Michael Psellos über Platons Phaidros. (Sonderabdruck aus 'Hermes,' XXXIV.)

—— Glossarium sive vocabularium ad oracula Chaldaica confecit A. J. (Tirage à part de la 'Revue de Philologie,' XXIII 2.)

—— Biographie von Carl Jahn. Bern, *K. J. Wyss,* 1898.

Juvenalis ad satiram sextam in codice Bodl. canon. XLI additi versus XXXVI. Exscripsit E. O. Winstedt. Accedit simulacrum photographicum. Oxonii, *E typographeo Clarendoniano,* MDCCCXCIX. 1s.

Moore (John Leverett). Exercises for Translation into Latin Prose. (Gilder-sleeve-Lodge Latin Series.) New York, *University Publishing Co.*, 1898. 50 cts.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II: Deutsch-Englisch. Lfg. 12: HERZ–JUXIG. Lfg. 13: K-KOST. New York, *The International News Co.* @ 1 m. 50 pf.

Neilson (Nellie). Economic Conditions of the Manors of Ramsey Abbey. (Bryn Mawr Diss.)

Neue Jahrbücher u. s. w. II. Jahrgang. III. u. IV. Bandes. 5., 6., 7., 8. Heft. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1899.

Newcomer (C. B.) De Cyclope Homerico atque Euripideo. (Diss. Berol.) Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1899.

Oertel (Hanns). The Jaiminiya Brahmana Version of the Dirghajivni Legend. (Actes du onzième Congrès international des Orientalistes, 1897.) Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1899.

Paget (F.) An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of Ecclesiastical Polity. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press.* New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1899.

Pater ad filium. Carmen praemio aureo ornatum in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano. Accedunt quatuor poemata laudata. Amstelodami, *ap. Io. Mullerum*, CIƆIƆCCCXCIX.

Patrick (Mary Mills). Sextus Empiricus and Greek Scepticism. (Berne Dr. Diss.) Cambridge (Engl.), *Deighton, Bell & Co.*, 1899.

Radermacher (L.) Studien zur Geschichte der antiken Rhetorik. IV. Ueber die Anfänge des Atticismus. (Sonder-Abdruck aus dem 'Rheinischen Museum für Philologie,' N. F., Bd. LIV.)

Revue des humanités en Belgique. Publication trimestrielle, III 1. Hasselt. Juillet, 1899.

Richardson (Charles F.) The Place of Sentiment in the Intellectual Life. (College of William and Mary ΦΒΚ Address.)

Rivista di storia antica e scienze affini. Direttore Giacomo Tropea. Anno IV. Fasc. 3. Messina, 1899.

Root (R. K.) Andreas. Translated from the Old English. (Yale Studies in English, A. S. Cook, Editor, VII.) New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1899.

Schanz (Martin). Geschichte der römischen Litteratur. 2. Teil: Die römische Litteratur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian. 1. Hälfte: Die Augustische Zeit. (Müller's Handbuch, 8. Band. 2. Abt. 1. Hälfte.) München, *C. H. Beck*, 1899. 7 m.

Schmidt-Wartenberg (H.) Phonetische Untersuchungen zum lettischen Akzent. (Aus 'Indogermanische Forschungen,' X 3 u. 4.)

Sommer (P. F.) Die Komparationssuffixe im Lateinischen. (Leipziger Habilitationsschrift.) Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1899.

Stahlii (I. M.) Emendationes Sophocleae. Index lect. Monasteriensium. 1899.

Sykes (F. H.) French Elements in Middle English. Oxford, *Horace Hart*, 1899.

Weil (Henri). Denys d'Halicarnasse. Du style de Démosthène. Observations critiques. (Revue des études grecques.) Paris, *Leroux*, 1899.

Wheeler (B. I.) The Origin of Grammatical Gender. (Reprint from 'Journal of Germanic Philology,' vol. II, No. 4.)